Library of
Wellesley College

PRESENTED BY
Mrs. Abraham Lansing.
91515

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
Boston Library Consortium Member Libraries

http://www.archive.org/details/wesselgansfortli02gans

IOHANNES WESSELUS GANSFORT.

Zie hier den Ganzevoort, dat groote weereld lygt,
Welk in de duisternis den standaardt heeft gestygt
Van t Euangely, en aan Kaprie de gronden
Wees, hoe men op zyn spoor de heytheer moest verkonden.

G. Outhof.

WESSEL GANSFORT

LIFE AND WRITINGS

BY

EDWARD WAITE MILLER, D.D.

SOMETIME PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY IN AUBURN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PRINCIPAL WORKS

TRANSLATED BY

JARED WATERBURY SCUDDER, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF THE LATIN LANGUAGE IN THE ALBANY ACADEMY

"If I had read his works earlier my enemies might think that Luther had absorbed everything from Wessel, his spirit is so in accord with mine."

—*Luther's Letter to Rhodius.*

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOLUME TWO

ILLUSTRATED

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

NEW YORK AND LONDON

The Knickerbocker Press

1917

Copyright, 1917
by
CATHERINE GANSVOORT LANSING

91515

The Knickerbocker Press, New York

This work is published as Special Volume Number Two in the Papers of the American Society of Church History.

CONTENTS

PAGE

THE SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST . . . 3

THE FARRAGO

SECTION

I.—THE DIVINE PROVIDENCE 71

II.—THE INCARNATION AND PASSION . . . 105

III.—THE DIGNITY AND POWER OF THE CHURCH . 149

IV.—THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE 185

V.—THE COMMUNION OF THE SAINTS . . . 247

VI.—PURGATORY 273

ADDENDA

BIOGRAPHY BY HARDENBERG 317

SKETCH BY GELDENHAUER 345

CRITICAL APPENDIX 349

INDEX 355

A TREATISE BY THE VENERABLE MASTER WESSEL OF GRONINGEN CONCERNING THE BLESSED SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST; AND THE HEARING OF THE MASS

A TREATISE BY THE VENERABLE MASTER WESSEL OF GRONINGEN CONCERNING THE BLESSED SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST; AND THE HEARING OF THE MASS

CHAPTER I

How the Hearer during Mass should occupy his Thought, viz., by Fixing it Solely upon the Purpose for which our Lord instituted this Rite.

DURING the celebration of masses we should neither read nor pray, but simply remember the Lord's suffering, how his body was broken and his blood was shed for us. For a servant cannot be deemed faithful, if, without regard to his instructions, he does what in his own opinion is suitable for the house or useful to his master: for example, if his master were to ask for a cup and he were to hand him a tripod or if his master were to ask for bread and he were to give him a goblet. If he persists in annoying his master in this way, being no longer a faithful but an impertinent servant, he shall be beaten with many stripes. Christ invites us to his table not as servants but as friends, and bids all his guests make this feast a feast of love in remembrance of him, i.e. in remembrance of his broken body and shed blood.

At this table, although through the condescension of our host we are honored as guests, nevertheless because of our condition we are necessarily servants. Therefore if at this

table we impertinently persist in opposing our Master's commands, however commendable our act may be in itself apart from that hour, yet for that hour we are guilty of sin because of our impertinent rudeness. Hence Augustine is right in saying, "He who reads, sins; he who prays, sins." But you will say, "Is it then a sin to pray? Is it a sin to read sacred writings?" By no means. But to disobey a command is a sin. Our Lord and Master commanded us, as often as we do this, to do it in remembrance of him. Yet, deaf to his command, we treat him with contempt, and despite his injunction to remember his cup, fulfil not his will but our own. We act as though we were wiser than such a master, and having thrown off our service to him had become runaway freedmen. Scorning to obey him, or at any rate foolishly presuming that he will be pleased with something that is better than his command though contrary thereto, we are unaware of how much we deprive ourselves by such conduct. For it is this remembrance of him that constitutes the true Eucharist, as will be made clear hereafter. Great, therefore, is the insolence and sin of those who during the celebration of masses give attention to other matters, whether it be vigils for the dead or the appointed prayers for the hours. Indeed, I question whether it is at all permissible to think of anything at that time except that which our Lord enjoined, saying, "As often as ye do this, do it in remembrance of me." In obedience to this command during the mysteries of the mass we should neither read nor pray, but occupy ourselves entirely with the remembrance of what our Lord did and suffered for our salvation.

And if out of this remembrance there should spring any pious affection, we are bidden not to reject it, but to cherish and encourage it together with the root from which it sprang. For it was not without good reason or

profit to his disciples that the great teacher of the highest wisdom enjoined the remembrance of his works. He who of himself created all nature, knew that love is the head and hinge of all our actions, and that if our love be right and perfect, sincere and genuine, all things will be pure to us. For nothing is wont to excite love as much as a lover's great favors, since these are the most potent proofs of his love. Love, however, is not only the incentive but also the origin of love. Do you wish then to love? Recall what the Lord Jesus has done for you. For it is impossible to ponder frequently upon what your Lord, your God, your Saviour has done and borne out of love for you without loving him in return. To a cold heart the contemplation of a lover, and such a lover, is a fire enkindling it, and constraining it to return that love. Whether one will or no, he cannot but love if he remembers and reflects upon the love and tender devotion of his lover. The Lord of salvation has enjoined that salvation must begin with the remembrance of his works. If therefore you neglect this, nothing else that you may offer will be pleasing in the eyes of his majesty.

CHAPTER II

That we are bidden to take and eat the Lord's Body, and to do this in Remembrance of Him; and by thus Remembering Him we eat and are refreshed.

"Take, eat; for this is my body which is broken for you; this do ye, as often as ye do it, in remembrance of me." Here Christ made a great assertion and strengthened it with two commands. He commanded us to take and eat, and to do it in remembrance of him. It is as though he said: "Remember what I endured in my body,

not only as an example of patience for your imitation, but more than that—as the price I paid to redeem you from misery. For indeed my body was given to endure pains that you might not bear what you must have borne, had I not endured it for you. Thus my body broken for you will be your bread and food, feeding, nourishing, refreshing, preserving, strengthening, quickening, exhilarating, gladdening, stimulating you. Therefore you have eaten of it, as often as your remembrance of me has been thus efficacious, healthful and beneficial."

Hence, though there appear to be two commands, if taken strictly in their entirety there is but one. That which is set before our memory for consideration is also given to our intellect for analysis and reflection, but above all it is presented to our will, that we may embrace and dearly love it. For being adjudged by these three faculties of the mind to be needful, suitable, and gracious, it is necessary, it is fitting, it is delightful. What indeed is more necessary for our ruined, dead, miserable souls than life, redemption and salvation? What is more fitting, expedient or appropriate than that the full satisfaction, which we in no way could offer, should be offered for us? What is sweeter, more delightful or more blessed than that in that body broken for us, in that sacrificial flesh, in that dying man, God, the Word, the lover of our souls, should lie hidden, should abide and be revealed?

Gladly therefore, Lord Jesus, will I remember that thy flesh suffered for me, thy body was broken for me, thy life was relinquished for me, knowing that remembrance, if it be frequent, will not be unfruitful. For in remembering thee, not only by thy promise but also—which is far sweeter—by thy condescension, I have thee present with me. For how shall I truly eat of thy body broken for

me, without having thee present as the guest of my soul? But if I shall have thee condescending to be my rich and gracious guest (for all this thou dost promise to them that remember thee), why may I not on this account hope for even greater gifts? For he that believeth in thee hath eternal life. How then does he have eternal life, if he does not have thee? For thou, and thou alone, art the true and eternal life to all who believe and remember i.e. who believe without forgetfulness. For to one who forgets, what he believes is arid, barren, unfruitful and dead, exactly as if he did not believe. But to one who frequently remembers, since he is not forgetful of what he believes, life is no longer near or at hand, but it is in him. For unless life exists within and deep within, it is not life. In proportion therefore as I remember thee, Lord Jesus, I have thee as my wealthy guest, the inmate of my peasant hut. No longer will that hut seem poor to me, since such majesty honors it with his condescension. I know, I know that out of my hut and humble cottage thou wilt erect a noble house. For it is ill-befitting so great a guest not to erect a magnificent memorial of thy condescension. Therefore, O Lord, thou wilt grant not only that I may remember thee, but that my humble hut may be built up; thou wilt grant thy poor host the privilege of contemplating thy broken body, thou wilt grant him the power to discern, to reflect. For I know how much more I shall be instructed and inspired by the word of thy holy faith, if I consider, if I discern, if I reflect, than if I merely remember thy body broken for me.

It is evident that although this remembrance may result in true and eternal life in the simple, superficial interpretation of the words, it conceals a certain sublime life hidden beneath the surface,—a life which is revealed to the eyes of one who, penetrating deeper, considers, discerns and reflects.

CHAPTER III

What and how we should remember and think concerning Christ's Body that was broken for us; and why it was broken.

To me desiring to reflect, discern and consider, do thou, Lord Jesus, open the way to the inner life hidden in these thy words, revealing how great the work of that sacrifice is and how completely thy body was broken. By thy body therefore I understand in the first place absolutely everything corporeal in that sacred body of thine, in so far as it was capable of acting or being affected through the body. Hence that most sacred body of thine was broken not merely in the five outer senses, but also in all the inner organic powers of imagination contained in thy heart, head, nerves, system and constitution. But more than that, I understand that it was broken in thy mental faculties, the memory, intellect and will, in all that inward power which even the angels do not possess, but which thou hadst while on earth. Sublime indeed was the flesh which John the Evangelist meant when he said the Word became flesh!

And unto whom was thy body delivered? Not indeed unto friends to be caressed, fondled or comforted. Unto whom then was it delivered but unto foes, who hated thee and sought thy death? Hence to those who believe and through faith also remember thee, it may seem sufficient that thy body was delivered unto the Jews to be crucified and to suffer death. And in fact to the simple-minded this simple belief in thee and remembrance of thy toil and weariness, thy pains, griefs and wounds, thy perplexity, affliction, exhaustion, abandonment and suffering is efficacious unto salvation. But when, besides thus remembering, I reflect that thy body was broken for me, and discern what misery—due by divine decree—was

awaiting me unless a ransom were paid with perfect equity, I find that thy body was broken by sufferings with which I myself should have been broken. For otherwise it would not have been for me that it was broken. I indeed had three enemies, the Judge, the Advocate, and the Executioner; the Judge armed with justice, the Advocate with truth, the Executioner with malignity. Unto these therefore I should have been delivered. But in my stead, ruined as I was, thy body, my sweet Saviour, was broken, —and so broken that the Judge was reconciled, the Advocate was moved to praise, the Executioner was confounded. Hence thy body was broken for the purpose of paying whatsoever the wantonness of that most cruel executioner was about to wreak upon me. But this was not merely to sate his cruelty, but because from the beginning he envied thee, the Lamb, with base hatred. For, seeing that this Lamb would be the king of glory, that most wicked Dragon together with his entire cohort of vipers, asps and serpents was ever seeking thee with poisoned tooth. To him then thou wast delivered, that he might do to thee whatever he with all his innate strength, subtle skill and wicked malice could conceive, devise and accomplish. But thou, O most gentle Lamb, in the assurance that the mouth of them that speak lies should be stopped, didst endure all his assaults so bravely and patiently, that in all that base cohort there was not one that could open his mouth and hiss. Yet, though this thy victory is the great glory of thy kingdom, and those who declare that thou art the brave and holy king of glory, may rightly and truly sing of it, yet it was necessary that even the mouth of thine enemies should be filled with thy praise, in order that out of a full heart they also might forever break forth declaring that thou art brave in battle,— worthy acclaimers indeed, because they can truly estimate the worth of him, whom God smote and angels persecuted,

while the assaults of demons added to the pain of his wounds.

As I thus reflect and discern, it seems necessary that my Judge (who cannot be reconciled save with full equity) should have been reconciled through thy body, broken for me. I find therefore that it was delivered to the Jews; I find that it was delivered to the populace and soldiers; I find that it was delivered to the Dragon and all his demon angels. Thy life indeed was in thine own hands, so that no one could take it away from thee; thou alone hadst the power to lay it down at thy will. Hence the ferocity of the Dragon could in no wise cut it off until thou didst know that the sacrifice of thy holy priesthood was completed; and this none could know but thyself, thou angel of great wisdom, who art acquainted with the hidden decrees of God. For thy body has been delivered unto a most pressing exactor, viz. divine justice, which could not be restored to its glory save by absolute equity. Indeed I regard it as far more sublime to satisfy divine justice than to stop the mouths of the most wicked demons or to fill the mouths of holy angels with praise. Truly, truly this was a great sacrifice, since it was so precious in the eyes of justice! Truly excellent is that cup of salvation which has to be taken worthily in order to render unto the Lord for all his benefits to us! For in the eyes of the most just God it was regarded as so great that it not only compensated him for the entire debt but even exceeded it! No longer must we merely take and remember that it is excellent, but we must drink of it. And since it is most sweet, we must drink of it again and again even unto intoxication—but only where it will be given us with sober eyes to see clearly, to reflect and to discern. Meanwhile since here on earth with eyes still dull we see but poorly and blindly, we are not carelessly to disregard the scanty drippings that fall upon the ground. For when

the sun has risen higher and they begin to glisten like the dew, they will lift us to the place whence they have come.

It is sweet to dwell on these things; it is sweet to ponder them; it is wholesome and fruitful to be occupied with them. To meditate on them, as I have said, is wisdom. But alas the nature and drift of my usual thoughts! For though they are by no means base (since indeed they do not spring from any base passion), yet, because they are simply rambling, careless, barren and mutilated thoughts, they prove me to be a man maimed, barren, careless and unstable. From the wandering current of my thought I can hope for no good haven. Long thinking on art produces the artist; thinking on prudence makes one prudent; meditation on knowledge makes one a scientist; the handling of cases makes the lawyer; thinking on wisdom makes a sage. But of what avail are fleeting, rambling, halting, careless thoughts? They produce nothing that is profound; they so weaken the mind that it cannot concentrate upon any point.

CHAPTER IV

That we are bidden to take the Lord's Cup also in Remembrance of Him; and the Great Benefit that arises from this Remembrance.

Thou dost command us, Lord Jesus, to take and eat thy body broken for us. Thou dost command us to take the cup and drink thy blood shed for us unto remission and redemption. And the Prophet declares that he will take the cup of salvation and thereby render unto the Lord for all his benefits toward him. Did he therefore thus render by taking the cup of salvation? Pray how can this cup be taken, unless indeed it is taken and drunk, just as also

the body, broken for us, is taken and eaten? The latter is eaten by remembering, since the remembrance of such great works of God is indeed life-giving bread. It brings to mind the sacrifice and victim offered for us, and as the bread of life restores us to complete well-being.

This surely must be the effect of such remembrance divinely inspired in us by the great gift of the presence of such a body, since in all other matters remembrance is so powerful and effectual, contributing to the perfection and consummation of all the arts and sciences, of all understanding and wisdom. Have not all things developed out of this kernel of meditation and remembrance? The results of science or art, however brilliant or remarkable, have been secured by pondering, remembering and reflecting,—from small beginnings bursting forth with splendor. Inland folk can scarcely conceive how much seamanship in its perfection can accomplish,—what huge cargoes a skillful pilot can transfer from one end of the world to the other. But such skill is not attained except by remembering, reflecting, comparing, discerning. Without this art of navigation the entire Eastern world would be useless to the West and the Western to the East. For who could carry such cargoes from our territory to almost another world without the use of ships? Behold then how small is the fount of remembrance, out of which so great a blessing issues even in a common matter!

What then should we believe, hope, nay confidently expect and most ardently thirst for as a result of our remembrance of thee, Lord Jesus? For thou hast promised, not that we shall attain some skill therefrom, but that thou wilt grant us thy personal presence, life, and life eternal. And what is this eternal life unless it be that, when we love thee perfectly, with pure hearts we shall see thee; and seeing, esteem thee worthily; and esteeming, divinely enjoy thee forever? We look for this life, when

we shall have put off the corruptible garment of mortality. In the meantime, however, we are not altogether destitute of life. Nay even here on earth we may live a great and vital life, if only we do not forsake this fount of life vouchsafed to us in the remembrance of the life-giving body broken for us. For through this remembrance of thee we shall receive grace, true wisdom to reach right decisions, and perfect righteousness. In these three things is found the greatest life that can fall to man under the sun. For what is more admirable than grace? What more illustrious than wisdom? What more sublime than glory? What more amiable than love? This life is not merely promised to those who remember; it is already actually bestowed upon those who remember with piety. Indeed he was given for us while we were still sinners and enemies turned away from God. When therefore the middle wall of enmity has been broken down and we have turned to him, why will not much more be granted to us, if we piously remember him? Long ago Esaias joyously cried, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given." Much more then will he, who was born and given to those who did not ask for him, be granted to those who seek him, if it but be with pious remembrance.

But why think that he desires to come to the dead, to delight in a decaying corpse? He is not the God of the dead, but only of the living. Therefore he is granted to those who remember him in order that they may live, and live unto grace. And if they persist in visiting the fount of life and continually remember him, grace will not be long barren in them, since both their meditation and the gift of their generous guest will quickly bring forth wisdom, and grace together with wisdom will be efficacious in producing glory. Moreover wisdom and glory will necessarily develop into the fruit of righteousness, even

love,—and this as we the more persistently continue our meditation.

Truly, therefore, Lord Jesus, there will be no excuse for my thinking of anything else but thee,—and thee crucified; especially now that I know what fruit attends the thought of thee. What did I just say? Nay, rather I should say, now that I know how great thou art and with what fruit thou comest to him that meditateth on thee. For life and death depend on our thoughts, since out of them proceeds life, and abundant life, and out of them also proceeds death.

Therefore, Jesus, sweetest lover of mankind, thou art not merely with them that remember thee to aid them, but thou art in them to give them life. I pray thee in view of my realization of thy presence now and at all times, grant that I, thy son, may always and everywhere faithfully remember thee; establish and strengthen me in the way of thy remembrance by which through thee, the Way, I may proceed unto thee, the Truth, and that I may finally attain unto thee, the Life. Grant that I may always meditate on thee, thy suffering, thy teaching, thy works and thy commands. May this meditation and remembrance be for me the beginning of the holy life.

For Christ was made unto us redemption, wisdom, righteousness and sanctification from God the Father. And that these may be wrought in us, because of his most gracious condescension, it is sufficient that we should remember him. For as often as we remember him, he is born unto us, he is given unto us; he is made the Way, the Truth, the Life, our redemption, wisdom, righteousness and sanctification from God, the Father.

Nor need we be disturbed by the word of the Wise Man, bidding us at a rich man's table diligently to consider what is set before us and reminding us that we must make ready for the feast beforehand; nor the word of John say-

ing, "He that saith he abideth in Christ, ought himself also to walk even as he walked." For it is only through frequent and pious remembrance that we fully achieve these results in him, who to this end was broken for us, who became the fullness of our redemption, righteousness and sanctification, if only we piously and constantly remember what he himself was made for us by God, the Father.

CHAPTER V

That by this Remembrance we are refreshed and released from all our Debts; that there is no Nearer Way to the Quiet of Reflection; its most Efficacious Results.

If therefore anyone desires to obtain great results with but little labor, to what can he more profitably resort than to this most salutary advice that he become accustomed frequently to remember this body and this flesh, that was broken for him; and remember that the Word from all eternity was God, but for a time became flesh. Let him also remember that it was God himself who in that flesh was broken for him, and whose blood was shed for him unto remission of his sins and redemption from all his debts and from the miseries due for his transgression; provided he remembers and accustoms himself as piously and faithfully as possible to remember without wavering that in very truth unto him was he born, unto him was given the bread of life, for him was it broken unto remission and redemption, and unto him he is made redemption, wisdom, righteousness and sanctification from God, the Father.

I do not say these things because there are no greater tasks to be undertaken by the Christian. I say them

solely in order that every one may know how broad, plain and easy a way of salvation God has made for the faithful, and that every one may be assured that if he will, he can have salvation before his doors and even springing up within his home. Yet I advise ordinary men in accordance with their strength to take merely this lower step of the ladder, and not to strive after higher, weightier, more difficult things; for I fear their inconstancy, cowardice, and confusion, fall and greater ruin. To my mind there is no nearer, shorter, straighter way to the blessed lot and better portion of Mary, the sister of Martha, who sat at the feet of Jesus, listening to his words, and sweetly and deeply drank from his lips, than by constantly remembering the Lord Jesus as that sacred "bundle of myrrh lying betwixt our breasts." All arts, all works of knowledge, counsel, bravery, wisdom, fidelity and benevolence have their beginning, seed and root in meditation and remembrance. It is also by meditation that they have grown and advanced toward perfection and when perfected shall be constantly fostered. Who then by failing to meditate upon this sacred and blessed memorial, given to those who fear the Lord unto the remembrance of all his marvelous works,would prevent it from becoming efficacious unto all the things for which God, the Father, sent his Word? For he sent the Word, that it might restore health; he sent it in the flesh for the life and health of the world. How then can anyone retain the Word that was sent except by remembering it? For unless one remembers, it escapes.

Meditation therefore in its origin is very close to the origin of the Word. For the same wisdom was necessary to originate meditation as to beget the Word. Surely then, if by virtue of its noble birth our meditation courts a proud and exalted marriage with the Word of eternal wisdom, our mind must contract this marriage by re-

membrance. Whoso does this unto remembrance of this great priesthood shall never be moved; he shall not be put to shame when he speaks with his enemies in the gate; he shall not appear before his God empty, seeing that he offers such great sacrifices of every kind.

And be not troubled by the lowliness of the act of remembrance, which serves, so to speak, as the stomach of the soul. For the foundation of man's life is bread and water. The bread of life represents the intellect, the water saving wisdom. These two things, life and salvation, must suffice. In this wisdom of "the little ones," we may sit at Jesus' feet with Mary and at the same time minister with Martha. For in ministering, whether it be on account of a neighbor's necessity or as an act of obedience, we can always have remembrance of the Lord Jesus and thereby obtain this benefit of his holy table. So much did he desire to teach us this, that he was most careful to leave us this dearest pledge of his love.

CHAPTER VI

Confirmation of the Preceding Chapter from the Words of Esaias; that we are by no Means justified by our own Righteousness; but only by Remembering Christ do we partake of Justification.

This opinion of mine noted above, if indeed one may have an opinion on matters so difficult and profound, is seen to be most strongly supported by the words of Esaias, nay rather by the words of the Lord as given by Esaias, Chapter XLIII, towards the end: "This people have I formed for myself; they shall show forth my praise. Yet thou hast not called upon me, O Jacob; nor hast thou been troubled for me, O Israel. Thou hast not brought

me the sheep of thy burnt offerings; neither hast thou honored me with thy sacrifices. I have not burdened thee with offerings, nor wearied thee with frankincense. Thou hast bought me no sweet cane with money, neither hast thou filled me with the fat of thy sacrifices; but thou hast burdened me with thy sins, thou hast wearied me with thine iniquities. I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and I will not remember thy sins. Put me in remembrance; let us plead together; set thou forth thy cause, that thou mayest be justified."

For what does this mean, "Thou hast not brought me the sheep of thy burnt offerings; neither hast thou honored me with thy sacrifices," except that these things are in no way worthy of God, whether it be unto his satisfaction or unto the glorification of his deity and majesty?

Then he adds, "I have not burdened thee with offerings, nor wearied thee with frankincense." And again, "Thou hast bought me no sweet cane with money, neither hast thou filled me with the fat of thy sacrifices": i. e. in order to worship and honor me devoutly and worthily with these gifts.

And yet since thou art my people whom I have formed for myself, that thou mayest know how I have formed thee, I add, "Thou hast made me to serve with thy sins, thou hast wearied me with thine iniquities." Therefore, "I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and I will not remember thy sins. Put me in remembrance; let us plead together; set thou forth thy cause, that thou mayest be justified." It is as though he said: "Since I have formed thee, therefore in order that my choice in accordance with my purpose and by my great plan may be established in an eternal covenant, thy sins have made it necessary for me to suffer for thee, to serve,

i. e. even to take the form of a servant, and to be wearied for thee. Therefore I have taken the cup which the Father hath given to me in thy stead, the cup which he hath commanded me to drink with sorrow even unto death and with distress even unto bloody sweat, and to become obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

And he who thus served and was wearied for us, what gifts, what labors, what frankincense, what sacrifices, what burnt offerings, what compensation, what return does he demand that we may not appear ungrateful and empty before God? Nothing save this, "Put me in remembrance," i. e. "Do it in remembrance of me." And to the same end he says, "Set forth thy cause that thou mayest be justified"; for by remembering and confessing my service and labor, thou shalt take the cup of salvation, and in so doing thou shalt render unto the Lord who served and toiled for thee, and thou shalt reap the fruit of his holy service and toil by thy remembrance and confession.

One word remains, "Let us plead together." But this is sufficiently explained by the Apostle when he declares that all who shall eat worthily must discern the Lord's body, and prove themselves, and thus eat. For he who confesses all his own unworthiness and insufficiency, he who confesses the Lord's greatest gifts and through them is confident of justification,—he indeed truly proves himself. And whoever confesses the love of him who suffered, and discerns the body broken for him, discerns the Lord's body. Hence with altogether unlike and yet with holy and salutary judgment he is judged together with the Lord; and thus eats, and offers the greatest incense and burnt offering to the Lord. Nor can he offer anything greater; for with no sacrifice of his own will he be justified or be pleasing to the Lord.

CHAPTER VII

That the Lord's Body, the True Bread, is the Refreshment and Life of the Inner Man; that it was broken by the Father with Exceeding Love; and that it refreshes through Love, which the Bread that Moses gave did not do.

"It was not Moses that gave you the bread out of heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread out of heaven." How could Moses give the true bread out of heaven, when he could not give even the corruptible bread out of earth? For otherwise, when the people he had led out of Egypt were hungry and murmuring because the scattered manna was failing, he would not have put them off in their hunger until he had tempted them to murmur against the Lord. Nay, it was not Moses that led them forth. For who was it that led and fed Moses himself but he who because it was his pleasure for forty days sustained Moses without bread? Indeed even the outer man lives by the word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God more than by visible bread. Did I say "more than"? I should have said "only." For the corporeal outer man lives only by the word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. How can material and visible bread refresh the stomach, be converted into blood, and nourish the body any more than stones and earth can? Whence comes this power but by the word of him who commanded the grain to come forth out of the earth? It is then by his command that the visible bread through the bodily organs strengthens the eater's heart, as it is by his will that it is digested by the stomach, drawn into the liver, changed into blood, and distributed through the veins into the limbs. It is by his will that all the forces of nature, all its changes, processes and growth are fixed within their appointed limits; so that, if he ceased to exert his will

for even one moment, everything would return forthwith to its original state, nothing. Hence it was by the will of the Creator that hay was given the power of nourishing cattle and bread of nourishing man. If he so willed it, the dust of the earth, gravel and stones could refresh men and cattle with equal ease, pleasure and usefulness. But in order that the manner of his giving might not arouse insolence in the recipient, he limited his generosity in the grain of corn, that out of it the life of the body might be sustained.

Now just as there is the outer man and the life of the outer man and the nourishment of the outer life, so there is the inner man, the life of the inner man, and the nourishment of the inner life. Even as this inner man is invisible, so also he lives an invisible life and is nourished and strengthened by an invisible bread, and just as in the nourishment of the body the stomach does not exist for the food but food for the stomach, so that not only is grain sought for men and hay for cattle, but it is known to be salutary; so if we closely examine and clearly apprehend the inner man, we shall more nearly conjecture what his spiritual nourishment is. Now according to Paul's definition the inner man is "that which hath been created after God." Nor is this at variance with what God said at the creation of mankind, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." Hence the inner man, made in the image and after the likeness of God, lives when he is God's image and likeness. But how shall he be God's image except by the imitation of him whose image he is? Therefore in order that he may live, he must imitate God and be like him. We cannot be like him in being omnipotent, all-wise, all-dominant; but we are not commanded to imitate him in these respects. There is one thing which he especially wished to show, which he especially wished men to believe and extol in him, viz., that he is

φιλάνθρωπος, i.e. a God who loves men, and so loves them that he gave his Son for the world. What, I ask, did he do less than if he had given himself? For he loves his Son as himself, inasmuch as the Son alone with the Father is God. God therefore so loved man that he emptied himself, that he humbled, delivered, offered, sacrificed, slew, consumed, gave his beloved life unto death, he being made obedient to God, the Father, even unto death. Behold here God, and such a God that if you love yourself you cannot desire him to be otherwise. For what can be conceived more profitable or better for life, salvation, blessedness or glory than that the Lord of all, all-wise and omnipotent, should love, and so love that he not only gave himself to you but for your sake, delivering himself into the hands of his enemies and yours and unto their most cruel passion, in order that he might rescue your wretched self from your enemies, and when rescued might heal you, and when healed might save you, and when saved might raise and glorify you, and when made all-glorious might embrace and kiss you in abiding love and might make you to abound in everlasting delight and bliss? Any man who was the recipient of such favors would indeed live; this is the life of the inner man!

O love wholly incredible, had God not made it more than credible by his testimonies! Indeed these blessings were made credible only through the cooperation of God, who confirmed the evidence of his testimonies by signs that followed,—such wonders as none but God can perform. And so God declares that he himself, who performs these miracles, is the author of these signs, since it is he who both speaks and operates. Thus his testimonies strengthened by miracles clearly show forth his marvelous love.

He who is not moved by such love, declared by divine testimonies and miracles, is dead; he who is not influenced by it, is stupid; he who is not enkindled by it, is cold.

But he who is moved, affected, influenced and enkindled to love, inasmuch as he glows with fervor like unto God, his lover, begins to be like his God. And by likeness, as has already been said, he is made the image of the Creator, God.

You have therefore the inner man, you have the life of the inner man, i.e. man's memory, intelligence and will. Life indeed, the likeness of burning love! Whenever a man lives such a life, how great the image of God appears in our lands,—how powerful, brave, eager, ready, quick, rejoicing in every good work; wise, intelligent, prudent, circumspect, provident, discerning every saving truth; loving, trusting, free from care, hopeful, expectant, exultant; despising, scorning, lightly esteeming, esteeming as nothing; steadfast, serene, constant; seeking nothing outside, within sufficient unto himself! Does it not seem to you that such a man is in some small measure a god and that he lives a blessed life even on earth? All these things however are wrought in weak, corruptible man by love alone. Hence love is the breath and life of a godlike and blessed man. And in order that he may live and continue to live and do the works of his life in health and strength, food and bread that strengtheneth man's heart is required. But this food and drink is the sublime Eucharist, the sublime gift of the sacrament, of which he bade all who hunger and thirst to eat, and setting forth the reason for it, added, "For this is my body which is broken for you." And again he bade all who thirst to drink of this cup, "For this is my blood of the new covenant which is shed for many unto remission of sins." Hence to one who lives and hungers, the bread when eaten is not only bread but nourishment. Just as therefore the inner man is a spirit and his life also is spiritual, so this bread must be spiritual and must be eaten spiritually. For except we eat this bread, we have not life in ourselves.

CHAPTER VIII

That if the Lord's Body and Blood be merely taken Corporeally they will cause Death; if received Spiritually they give Life; but, if by Faith they be taken in Bodily Form, they work Spiritual Life.

Now the body and blood of the Lord Jesus, however sacred they may be, are nevertheless body, and not spirit. Hence if they be merely taken corporeally, they not only will not spiritually refresh the eater, but they will cause his death. For he that eateth unworthily, shall be guilty of the Lord's broken body and shed blood; so that it would be better for him, if that man had not been born. It is not the flesh of Christ that justifies, nor his blood; but the work he offered for us through his blood and flesh. Hence the Lord said, "It is the spirit that giveth life; the flesh profiteth nothing"; i.e. the flesh, however sacred, does not suffice. But the greatness of the work and the ineffable love and charity of him who offered them through the Holy Spirit,—this it is that giveth life. Nevertheless it by no means follows that his flesh and blood in no way operate for the justification of the communicant. For whosoever with unfeigned faith in the omnipotent God believes that under the visible bread and wine in very truth that sacred flesh and blood is actually present with most potent condescension, most condescending beneficence and most beneficent results,—he experiences some spiritual life in himself, (unless perchance he believes and eats with absolutely no longing). But he that eats without reflecting or discerning or pondering or tasting, he eats—to be sure,—but merely with his body and senses, not spiritually. Hence he is not spiritually made alive. For no one is made alive in holiness and righteousness by such faith,—a faith which is even found in those who cause death; "the devils also believe and shudder."

However much therefore one may eat and drink the visible Eucharist with his teeth and mouth, if the inner man does not live after God, he does not eat. For "if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever." It follows logically from this that he who does not live forever does not eat of this bread. Whoever therefore eats visibly, does not eat, unless he eats spiritually. But how shall we know how to eat spiritually unless we are taught by him who gave the bread and commanded life? Let us therefore be taught by him, the master who hath the words of life. Let him teach us, beginning with the elementary principles, by believing which we draw near to God. For how shall we go away, turning from him who hath the words of life and promiseth his faithful disciples eternal life, saying, "He that believeth on me hath eternal life"; not only in the spirit, but also in the body "I will raise him up in the last day"?

Behold how sublime, how quickening a source of life is faith,—a faith that is not feigned as with the Pharisees nor forced as with the devils, but is accompanied by a spontaneous and confident assent and drawing nigh unto God! Hence, as though it were in the nature of things, all languages derive *faith* and *faithful* from kindred nouns of the same root, the Latin *fidelis* from *fides*, the Greek πιστός from πίστις, the Hebrew *ne'eman* (נֶאֱמָן) from *'emunah* (אֱמוּנָה); and similarly the Italian, French and German, when these tongues are examined in their purity. What does this fact suggest but that he is faithful who maintains that he has faith; and that if he is not faithful, he has not faith?

Perhaps you will say that faith is not required, in order that he who eats of this bread may live; but that according to the word of our Teacher it suffices that a man should believe, even if he should not lead a faithful life. But if you look into it more closely, you will find that those who

say they believe do not truly believe, unless at the same time by believing they become faithful and virtuous. For no one can believe a person whom he does not regard as faithful. How then shall a man who regards God as faithful to his promises despise the greatness of his promise or doubt the truth of him who promises? Therefore, he who believes God when he promises, at the same time with his belief acquires faith and fidelity and the first rudiments of wisdom, believing that what God adds is true and what he promises is sublime, prepared to listen to his teacher and to follow his leader.

Therefore thirsting he hears, "The words which I speak are spirit and are life." And he receives them, rejoicing; for when spiritually apprehended they bestow the life that is not carnal. For the spirit maketh alive the inner man and the carnal mind profiteth nothing unto these things. Hence it comes to pass that carnal minds do not believe words that spiritually make alive, but turning aside from the word they have heard, go away with the accomplices and confederates of perdition, and at last become traitors. It was not without reason that it was said, "He himself knew from the beginning who they were that believed not and who it was that should betray him." For while the faith of those who believe on him is fruitful unto the full extent of the blessed life, the folly of unbelievers, if it advances, is fruitful unto all malice, even to the pit of perdition. Thus he who, being bound by foolish desire for pleasure or vanity, disbelieves the word of life, presently fettered by evil habit will be unable to free himself from the tyrant's yoke, and out of what was at first folly will be forced to descend into iniquity. To this Sirach testifies saying, "He that keepeth company with harlots will be worthless." Thus the dissembler becomes the traitor, who unless he feigns friendship and conceals his enmities will be, not a traitor, but a persecutor.

Safe then from these ways of death is the faith of those who faithfully believe the words of life. "He that believeth on me hath eternal life." For he listens and learns from God by what steps of salvation he is to walk and advance unto life. With faith therefore he hears God commanding, "Take, eat, this is my body." Faithfully also he obeys the other command, "As often as ye do this, do it in remembrance of me." Hence he believes faithfully in the sacrament, he faithfully commemorates it as a sacrament, with fixed mind remembering both the broken body and the shed blood and that the body was broken for him and the blood was shed for the remission of his sins.

He not only believes and frequently remembers, but he also carefully considers the things set forth in this sacred feast as well as their nature and importance. For in the law concerning showbread the bread is called *Lehem panim* (לחם פנים), i.e. the bread of faces, as if set forth face to face, so that it shall not escape the consideration of him who draws near, believes and remembers. And if he shall eat, believing, remembering and considering, his heart will be strengthened unto a higher step of life, so that like the Virgin Mother, hearing, he shall believe, remember, consider, and ponder, keeping all these sayings in his heart. But if he keeps and ponders them, his heart will be strengthened, so that like Paul he shall discern; and discerning, like animals that are clean in accordance with the law he shall ruminate; and ruminating, like men after the Lord's heart he shall taste that the Lord is good; and tasting, he shall delight himself in the Lord, who now giveth him all the desires of his heart. Surely such an one, because he tastes and delights himself, hungers and longs for thy halls, O Jerusalem, where at last he shall be filled with peace and abundance of corn; he loves, he glows, he burns, he pines, he faints with love, being in a strait until

he shall be with Christ, the bread of his desires. For nothing refreshes, nourishes, strengthens, exhilarates, makes glad and satisfies a lover as much as the first favors of the beloved, which we now. in the Eucharist, behold by faith but which at last we shall see clearly, face to face.

CHAPTER IX

That the Life we obtain when we eat the Lord's Flesh and Blood is the Life of the Inner Man; and inasmuch as that Life is Spiritual, it must be eaten Spiritually.

"Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves." Manifestly it must be admitted that the life, of which he speaks, is the life of the inner man, i.e. life in the Holy Spirit. Necessarily therefore it must also be admitted that when he says, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood," we are to understand that it is an inward eating and drinking, i. e. of the inner man. But how does the inner man eat the flesh and drink the blood, when he is nothing but mind, intelligence? The inner man, i. e. the memory, intellect and will, should be occupied with the Word that became flesh, with God who became man, with his times, desires, doctrines, examples, precepts, benefits and promises, just as the mouth, throat and stomach of the outer man are employed with a feast. Even as the latter take, eat, taste, chew, delight in, prove, approve, accept, and transmit to the belly, and are thereby nourished, strengthened and invigorated for life's work; so with regard to that flesh which was assumed in oneness of person by the eternal Word, as embodying his works and desires, his doctrines and examples, his precepts, sacraments, gifts, and promises, we with un-

remitting thought in the inner man must meditate, reflect, consider, compare, ponder and keep in our hearts. By the exercise of our intellect, we must discern, value, raise and exalt it in accordance with its dignity and sublimity. With all our will we must desire it, long for it, pant for it, esteem it, love it, pine for it, and in love seek and invoke its presence.

He who thus eats the flesh of the Son of man need not dread the death of the inner man; for the life of the inner man (which is truly spirit and life and the third person in the Trinity and thereby the eternal God) cannot be "of him that willeth or runneth," because it is the one Spirit of the Father and the Son. His life is solely in that Spirit, so that he, who from eternity truly is the Spirit of the Father and the Son, becomes through God's compassion the life of that man who spiritually eats the flesh of the Son of man and drinks his blood. He also becomes one Spirit with him; for he who clings to God is made one Spirit with God. But how can we, who are flesh, cling to God except through the flesh that has been united to God? The Wise Man did not forbid excessive eating of this flesh or drinking of this wine when he said, "My son, be not among wine bibbers or among gluttonous eaters of flesh." Indeed when such flesh is "gluttonously eaten," it is a sacred and holy feast. For it is the bread and wine of eternal wisdom inviting us, urging us by his command, nay commanding us upon threat of death to eat and drink. And if we shall eat and drink, the true life of the inner man is not merely promised, it is already imparted to us. For such eating of that flesh and drinking of that blood is so acceptable to God that simultaneously with it the Spirit and life are bestowed upon those who eat. He who thus eats already has the benefit of outward sacramental eating, just as Paul, the first hermit, and very many after him had it even without the outward sacra-

mental eating. To eat therefore is to remember, to esteem, to love.

At this point it is incumbent upon us to reflect upon feasting and nuptial banqueting with their differences and degrees. For remembrance is barren, if it does not pass on into discernment. And both remembrance and discernment are inefficacious, if in view of the worth of that which is remembered they are not kindled into longing and love.

CHAPTER X

That in order to obtain Life we must eat the Flesh of the Son of Man; and that we eat by Faith, as did Paul, the First Hermit, by Believing, Remembering, Discerning, Loving, etc.

"Except therefore ye eat" said he "the flesh of the Son of man," (which must be eaten by the wayfarer, whose exalted way leads through a pathless wilderness even unto Horeb, the Mount of God) "ye have not life in yourselves." Hence in order that ye may have life in yourselves, ye must eat the flesh of the Son of man. And if ye eat unworthily, ye eat unto judgment. The measure of the judgment is proportioned to the unworthiness of the eating, so that he who eats very unworthily, eats heavy judgment for himself. And he who eats with venial unworthiness will also be judged venially. Indeed he who eats worthily eats also unto his judgment, but unto judgment of his glory in the day of judgment, when glory will be rendered to the worthy, even as shame and confusion will be rendered to the unworthy. Nevertheless we should note most carefully the Lord's word, "Except ye eat, ye have not life in yourselves." They, however, who believe on him have true life. Hence those who believe on him

are they that eat his flesh. Now it is openly acknowledged that holy hermits had that life, though they hid in caves so many years. Therefore Paul, the first hermit, did eat of the flesh of the Son of man even during the time when he did not see a single human being, not to speak of a priest, celebrating the sacrament. But he did eat of it because he believed; and because he believed he frequently remembered; because he remembered he carefully considered; because he considered he ruminated; because he ruminated he tasted that it was sweet; because he tasted that it was sweet he desired; because he desired he hungered and thirsted; because he hungered and thirsted he knew that it was sweeter than honey and the honeycomb, he panted for it, he esteemed, he loved it, he pined with love, he was wounded by love for it. For if he did all this faithfully and honestly, he was "proclaiming the Lord's death." But to whom did he proclaim it except to himself? What sort of death did he proclaim? What was the nature of him who died? Why did he proclaim him if he died, unless it was because, although he was most holy and worthy to be exalted, he was willing to be emptied of his glory and to be humbled here on earth by reason of his love of God, who commanded his obedience even unto death—and that the death of the cross? If he faithfully proclaimed this death to himself till the Lord should come knocking, there can be no doubt that he was more aglow with fraternal love for such a first-born brother than with self-love.

This love of the Lord Jesus ought rightly to increase in us in accordance with the Apostle's word, "If any man loveth not the Lord Jesus, let him be anathema." In so far as we fall short of this, we eat—perhaps venially—unto our greater or less judgment. And of those who eat it is the degree of their love that determines the degree of their perfection. For before we attain unto perfection

in this eating, with fraternal love we must love the First-born among many brethren even more than we love ourselves. Nay, we must love him more than all the rest of our brothers, men and angels, until our fraternal love is properly graded to accord with the degrees of our brothers' worth. And since this our fraternal love is exercised toward a created being, i. e. toward the human nature which he assumed, sanctified, humbled for our sakes and exalted, on this account it will and ought to be of a lower degree than the love of God. Now as we individually are commanded in our earthly pilgrimage to be pure and holy priests, we must like the Virgin Mother offer unto God a sacrifice of our own, a burnt-offering of ourselves, "an incense for a sweet savor" of the Lord Jesus. But this incense cannot be offered to God by one who does not as yet, with fraternal love, love the Lord Jesus above all the brothers and above himself. He who thus loves the Lord Jesus has attained with Magdalene the next degree, so that Jesus ascends unto his Father in his heart, and so kindles him with the love of God that he also,—like the Lord Jesus, delivers, abandons, presents and offers Him as incense unto God. This gradual advance from strength to strength, I believe, was maintained by Magdalene, and I think that she not only rose to perfect love of the Lord Jesus, but more than that, in loving him perfectly, she perfectly offered that most holy incense. But I do not think that she reached the temple of God, the throne of the kingdom, the marriage chamber in any other way than by thus being holy, worthy, sublime and beautiful. I therefore believe that none of the sons of God will enter into that priesthood or kingdom or eternal wedding unless they mount up by such steps of cleansing and purification. They alone will be able to live in the eternal glow of divine love, because they alone will be made perfect by that true, pure, and real purgatory, and will indeed burn with

love. Nor do those who burn with such ardent affection need any external purgatorial fire; they are purified as they ascend the steps by which they attain this height. And this cleansing was necessary; for so long as they did not love perfectly they were excluded from the highest service of the temple, the throne and the marriage chamber. For him that runneth along this sublime way our indulgence-mongers will not be able to keep their indulgences intact, unless they affirm that the pope has plenary authority to provide for it, especially for its final stages. This statement is strongly confirmed by the first words of the 18th Psalm, "*Archamcha Jehovah* (אֶרְחָמְךָ יְהוָה)." For if this is to be verified, the Lord Jesus must assume a mother's womb,—concerning this I have written more expressly elsewhere.

In considering the foregoing remarks, careful attention should also be paid to the legitimate effect and use of other sacraments, as baptism and confession, for in these too the dead are revived. And because they already possess life they eat. Besides, by every act of justification the ungodly are revived, even as was the publican by his praying; for he went down justified; therefore made alive; therefore eating and drinking. And yet all the laity and all women have been excluded from actually drinking from the cup of the Lord's blood, though they truly have life in themselves. Hence, to eat his flesh and drink his blood perfectly is to drink out of love, and through love of him who was made our exemplar to become a sacrifice like unto the great sacrifice.

The last and highest class of those who eat is composed of those, who with the Virgin Mother are close to the "*Archamcha Jehovah* (אֶרְחָמְךָ יְהוָה)" mentioned above. This class preeminently partakes of the bitterness of the faithful lover, Magdalene. This is love that wounds perfectly, because it suffers and bears the cross together with the Lord Jesus, crucified more than if it were itself crucified.

CHAPTER XI

That All the Words to the Same Purport that are scattered through Scripture for the Purpose of Strengthening Man's Heart and Sustaining him along the Way should be included in this Discussion.

The foregoing remarks concerning the bread that strengthens man's heart for life's journey should include all the words to the same purport that are scattered throughout Scripture, in order that from all these viewpoints it may be seen to be the wayfarer's needed bread and provision.

Now since this bread is also a provision for the sustenance of the wayfarer, all the proclamations and announcements of the way that are scattered over the face of Scripture consistently declare that the way is very great, since it leads at last to very great blessings. For example, "Rise and eat, because the journey is too great for thee," i.e. it is a way arduous, sublime and exalted above our ways. Its difficulty and the height to which one must advance have been set forth—albeit somewhat obscurely—in the foregoing remarks. In this way, however much one walks and advances, he is still a wayfarer. Whoever believes begins the journey. "For he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek after him." This is the beginning of spiritual life—small indeed, but still the only beginning. For he that believeth on me hath eternal life, even as he also hath the kingdom of God within himself. Here on earth it is small and still sleeping, and though so potent, is like a dead grain of corn; yet with advancing cultivation it is to be aroused from that sleep of death and inactivity.

It is through this similarity between sleep and death that we may also understand the word of James concerning

the faith of true believers (even though they be "the little ones"),—that "faith, if it have not works, is dead"; not that they do not live unto God through the Holy Spirit, but that in regard to the deeds of the higher life they are asleep, and therefore are like unto the dead. For if babes were always to remain babes both to their parents and to the Church, must we not admit that they are as it were dead to all things and forever dead to the true life? Hence, though the faith of "the little ones" does indeed live unto God, yet here on earth it is dead compared with the life of those who advance and go from strength to strength. Nor should this seem to be an unreasonable statement concerning baptized infants or young persons who are weak in faith or those who are asleep, for even Paul, who was very strong in faith and in labors more abundant than all others, admits that because of sin his body was dead. Hence he even cries out, "Wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?" To Paul it was indeed a body of death in so far as, being corrupt on account of sin, it burdened his soul and kept his mind from rising to lofty ideas. For in so far as the body presses heavily upon us who are burdened on the way, in so far it is dead; we ourselves are dead, and our faith here on earth is dead. For that faith is dead which does not operate through love to discharge duties hitherto left undone. Hence in so far as it does not work, faith is still dead even in those who have received the first fruits of the Spirit, and yet groaning within themselves exclaim, "Who shall deliver us from the body of this death?"

Just as in motion there is a point from which it diminishes and a point toward which it is directed; yet at every point between these two termini there always remains some motion; hence motion may be called relative. Want of attention to this principle generally confounds

those who are not cautious and watchful, and thereby also troubles and disturbs others. Therefore every learned Scribe in the kingdom of God ought to be careful not lightly or quickly to declare an opinion that is based on some single passage. For he that said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," likewise said, "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven." He placed the beginning of salvation in the sacraments and the faith of those who receive them; but as a complement to this he made it depend upon "righteousness that exceeds." And this "righteousness that exceeds" is thereafter unfolded by the Saviour in the 5th, 6th and 7th chapters of the long Sermon on the Mount, which he thus concludes, "Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect." He also laid the same command upon Abraham, saying, "Walk before me and be thou perfect." If thou wilt do this, I will be thy great recompense. It is as though he said, "I shall not be thy recompense until—walking before me —thou shalt be perfect, worthy of God." On the way there is progress, at the end there shall be rest. But for one who is imperfect rest would be unfitting. Therefore at the end there is nothing imperfect. Hence it is necessary to lay aside every imperfection, to be cleansed, purified, healed and exalted before the end, and rest.

The entire way, its completeness, its end for each individual, and the particular manner, order and speed of his attaining the end are known to no mortal man, whatever his position or office. Therefore no mortal, however great his authority may be, has the power to fix or determine anything concerning the postponement or mode of his purification or the manner of reaching the end of this way.

CHAPTER XII

That All our Wisdom, Justification and Redemption are founded on the Lord's Sufferings; and that we do not attain these except by worthily Partaking; nor is there any Worthy Partaking except by Remembering, Keeping, etc.

The Lord Jesus said, Mark x. 45, "The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many." In I Cor. i. 30, it is even more clearly stated that all our wisdom, justification and redemption are founded upon Christ's sufferings. Manifestly also at the Supper the Lord Jesus based the remission of sins upon the faithful observance of the holy Eucharist. Similarly exemption from punishment is also based upon faithfulness in this regard by the words, "In whom we have our redemption through his blood." Eph. i. 7. But we do not obtain this redemption except by worthily partaking; nor do we partake except by remembering, keeping, pondering, discerning, reflecting, tasting, desiring, loving, imitating and through affection pining with love, until we worthily imitate him as God, like him offering ourselves as an incense of sweet savor unto God, and that for his sake. Now, although in Scripture redemption is often put for remission of sins, as e.g. "And he will redeem Israel from all his iniquities," yet more clearly and frequently it has the signification of deliverance rather than of remission. For we have redemption from misery, calamity, false accusation, captivity, slavery, tyranny, torture, torment and punishment. We are ransomed from all this by the blood of Christ, and through our zeal and faithfulness we partake of that blood. It is not by corruptible gold and silver, but by the precious blood of the Lamb that we have been ransomed from the hand of the enemy, from the hand of Satan, from destruction, from all the evil effect of our guilt and punish-

ment. But how are we ransomed by his blood except by partaking of his blood and flesh through faith and piety born of faith? But how does such piety do its duty unless through the degrees of increasing affection, until Christ shall have been fully formed in us?

CHAPTER XIII

The Sacramental Bread through its very Significance, by virtue of its being Sacramental, nourishes and quickens us with the Life of Wisdom and Discernment unto His Likeness.

Although material bread may delight with its odor and taste, yet if it be not eaten and received into the stomach, it does not refresh. But the sacramental bread, inasmuch as it is sacramental—and a sacrament is symbolical (*significativum*)—nourishes and refreshes by virtue of its symbolism. For it is not only in itself alive with the life of wisdom, of right discernment, and true love; but it is also the living bread, and the bread of life, and the bread that quickeneth, i. e. that quickeneth unto life like its own. Hence it quickeneth unto true wisdom, which is the wise knowledge of God; and unto right discernment, so that we highly esteem our God. And if we feel these two great lives of true wisdom and sublime esteem within ourselves, we have a pledge—so to speak—that the same bread is sure to quicken within us a third life, viz. the perfect love of God. This however will not be wrought by that bread suddenly. For the course of nature proceeds from small beginnings by regular growth gradually up to perfection. How greatly we would value bread, which would, by the mere sight of it, feed those who look upon it; which though but a single piece, would suffice for the complete satisfaction and efficacious refreshment of

a great many persons! How greatly then must we value this bread of ours that quickeneth sacramentally; for this indeed quickens and refreshes solely by its symbolism and by our pious remembrance! The other bread, though it might feed those who look upon it, still would not quicken them. But this sacramental bread quickens and refreshes a believer, even if he be dead. The other bread might refresh one who sees it, and yet would leave him blind, destitute of sight, unsatisfied. But this sacramental bread, when it has illumined the mind of the believer by its symbolism, quickens and feeds him simply through remembrance; and if he earnestly persists in remembering, it nourishes him and causes him to grow unto that life and blessed strength, which belong to the bread itself; for it is truly life-giving.

This point is illustrated by the story of the priest of Egher. Driven by the snow and cold of the Alps, he had wandered from the path, and hoping to find shelter from the winds and snows he had leaped down into a secluded valley, from which, however, he could find no exit nor could he climb back to the height from which he had leaped. Threatened with death from hunger, he threw himself down in the hollow of a projecting rock and despaired of life. But at night, as it was full moon, he saw snakes of various species hasten to a certain stone and lick it with their tongues; after a time each one returned to his own cave. He wondered greatly why they licked the stone in this way. On the following night the same thing happened. Then he was still more surprised, wondering why they did this. At length on the third night, being now almost destitute of strength, before them all he himself drew near and licked the stone. And even as he licked it, he was restored as though he had been refreshed with food. So throughout the winter he lay hidden beneath the rock, until at the end of April, when the snow

had melted and the Alps had become passable, he heard some persons talking near by. He called loudly to them, and at last he was dragged out and helped down to the nearest houses. Then being questioned about the accident that had befallen him, he truthfully told the main points of his story. Thereupon all the men were prompted to seek the place from which they had rescued him. But in spite of countless searches they could not find it.

Truly that stone had the power of bread and was efficacious bread. But it would have been far more efficacious, if it could have refreshed one who looked upon it, and that not with life in flesh and blood, but with the spiritual life of true wisdom, befitting esteem and holy love.

CHAPTER XIV

That in the Sacrament of his Body he hath made his Wonderful Works to be remembered; and how he himself is the Food that was torn by Wild Beasts, i. e. the Jews, but was given as Food unto the Nations that fear him.

"He hath made his wonderful works to be remembered, he hath given *Tereph* (טֶרֶף) unto them that fear him."

But how did he give *Tereph* to them that feared him, when he commanded all the people, if they wished to remain in ceremonial purity, not only to abstain from eating but even from touching *Tereph?* For in the Hebrew it is not food as it is rendered in our translation, but *Tereph.* Now *Tereph* is the dead flesh that was considered unclean because it was slain by wild beasts. At the end of the first law concerning the sin offering Moses commanded that, after the blood had been brought within the holy place, anything that was considered un-

clean should be offered outside the camp. He then added *Tereph jetareph* (וְשָׂרַף יִשָּׂרֵף) without any agreement in the first and second letter of the two words and without any distinction in their meaning. It is as though he said: "The sin offering shall be offered outside the camp and not in the tabernacle, because being torn to pieces by wild beasts, to the Jews it shall be unclean; but since it is made outside the synagogue, to the nations it shall be as if offered in a clean place." This law is interpreted by the Apostle as applying to Christ, who in the likeness of sinful flesh suffered outside the gate, being considered unclean and despised.

But the Lord Jesus, when he instituted the holy Eucharist at the Supper, more clearly connected these things, saying: "This is my body which is broken for you unto remission of sins; this is the cup of the new covenant in my blood, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins." Christ therefore, since he was delivered through envy and unjust hatred by the hands, nay rather by the tongues, of wicked men, and was accused and slain as a malefactor, is himself *Tereph* to those who persist in their unbelief; but to those who fear God, he serves as a remembrance of his marvelous works.

In like manner the Lord Jesus also commands, "Do this in remembrance of me." Indeed in this *Tereph*—as though under a seal—there is a summary of all God's wondrous deeds and decrees and desires as well as of his sufferings and promises and works. For it is more than marvelous that for the unjust and for those who had been condemned by God because they had offended against his majesty God himself condescended to become a sin offering to himself, to be despised and wretched. This is so wonderful that it even surpasses the works of his power, the works of his wisdom and the works of his sublimity, majesty and righteousness; so that when it comes to mind, the wonder of all God's other works waxes

old in comparison. Truly we ought to recall all the marvelous works of God more often in the commemoration of our Lord. But how are we to remember him unless —as Solomon says—by carefully considering the nature and importance of the things that are set before us when we are invited to this great dinner at the rich man's table? For he that does not discern that the body is that of the Lord God not only eats unworthily, but together with Annas, Caiaphas and the Pharisees will be guilty of despising it.

Yet even remembrance and diligent reflection will not suffice to make this saving sacrifice bear perfect fruit in ourselves; but we must remember and diligently reflect in order to know that we must prepare such things. When therefore we carefully consider the nature and importance of the things that God in man has done, taught and endured for us, it will be necessary to know every single thing that we must make ready. For God will be pleased with our sacrifice only when it shall be found to conform to that most acceptable sacrifice of the High Priest, Jesus. Hence it will not be enough to recognize and know that we must prepare these things unless we also attain to such a true degree of grace that we shall prepare them with all our heart, spirit, soul and brain.

CHAPTER XV

The Steps in the Preparation of the Faithful in order that we may prepare for such Things as have been placed before us on the Lord's Table.

Therefore the first step of righteousness that is required of all faithful disciples consists in faithfully believing and remembering the Lord Jesus in all their ways. The second is that they should diligently consider all things that are his. The third is that after tasting of his sweetness

they should at least make ready to imitate him. The last is that bearing the reproach of Christ they should glory in his cross. And thus, being crucified together with the Lord Jesus, in the day of the Lord, that shall come swiftly as though it were to-day, however great a malefactor and robber he may be, he shall be with him in paradise.

They however who linger on the three first steps must learn that though they are saved by hope, nevertheless being unclean they will be detained from entering until by mounting these steps they shall at last reach the fourth. For the faithful, i.e. "the little ones" in Christ, are commanded by the Lord Jesus to remember; while those who make progress are commanded by Solomon diligently to consider. And they that frequently do these two things come to see and taste that the Lord is sweet; and if they truly taste, they will grow, they will be roused, strengthened and inspired to imitate him. To the first Christ is milk; to the last he is solid food and bread. Yet to all the faithful—first, middle and last—he is food to be eaten by seeing with the inward eye, by remembering, considering, desiring and loving; but he is not food to be torn with the teeth.

This is also what was meant by the Law, when it called the holy bread in the temple upon the golden table "the bread of faces," which our translators have rendered "showbread." Abraham too was food for the faithful, since when God commanded him to take his only begotten son, Isaac, whom he loved, and offer him upon one of the mountains, he obeyed by going to the place and fulfilling the command; having been surely invited to the table of his ruler, God, who so loved the world that for it he gave his only begotten son, who became "*Tereph jetareph.*" In accordance with Solomon's command Abraham considered the nature and importance of the proofs of love that were placed before him at the feast. Besides he knew that those that are invited must prepare for these

things, since those who have the feast and the proofs of the highest love placed before them should also prepare to return the highest love. For it will be a feast of love, of which no one will be worthy unless he has on the wedding garment and returns a like love. Hence those severe but true words of the Lord Jesus, "Whoso hateth not his life for my sake is not worthy of me." For all the saints are unworthy to come to that feast of blessed love, so long as any blemish of alien love defiles their minds and keeps them from his holy embrace. Moreover since ecclesiastical authority cannot bestow such purity and dignity of love, it is also clear that it cannot take away penal deferment from the kingdom and from his embrace. For since that punishment, of whatever sort it may be, cleanses the impurity that remains and restores it to purity, in faithful accordance to the custom of the Fathers it is called purgatorial.

It is only genuine love that does not seek cleansing and purification. It is a strange fact that in the service of love, provided the object of love be truly worthy, the more one who loves persists in losing his own life for the sake of him whom he loves, the more will he find that he saves himself. To this the Psalmist—or rather the Holy Spirit through the Psalmist—testifies, "Yea the sparrow hath found her a house and the swallow a nest for herself, where she may lay her young, even thine altars, O Lord of hosts." If we accept these words as applying to the sparrow and the swallow that were offered in the rites of the Law, they are far from true. For the animals that were offered for sacrifice, whether burned in the temple or in the tabernacle, did not return to life in order to live there forever on the altar. But if they are symbolical as related to these ceremonial sacrifices, then they are absolutely true. For the sparrow that sacrifices its sportiveness and the swallow its innate purity as an offering to God not

only receives back its very self, but being put to death for God it bears and receives its fruit an hundred fold. It is only the service of such love that is consummated and perfected. This alone is the true incense of sweet savor that affects and pleases God. For surely he here sees in the work of his own hands a great likeness to himself. This is the true *latria* that is worthy of God alone; he will not give this his glory to another, nor will this incense be found outside the temple of the Lord. And whoso hath it, is already among the highest priests, so that he may enter the holy of holies, whatever his order, degree, sex, age or condition.

CHAPTER XVI

That by no Righteousness of our own are we made Worthy of so Great a Sacrament; nevertheless we are bidden to eat; and the Unworthy are threatened with Death.

"All our righteousness is as filthy rags." Who then am I, Lord Jesus, King of glory, Lord of lords, consecrating priest, sanctifying sacrifice, Prince of peace, Father of the age to come; who, I say, am I that thou shouldst turn aside to my abode, to the poor hut of a sinful man? Truly I am not worthy that thou shouldst come beneath my roof,—unless thou wilt either forthwith make me absolutely worthy (a state to which angels themselves do not presume to attain), or else wilt graciously decree that even here on earth thou wilt not impute my unworthiness to my unworthy self. The former alternative, in view of human frailty, is impossible, it is also contrary to thy way. Therefore true faith in thy graciousness compels me to trust to the latter. For thou not only dost command me to take and eat in remembrance of thee, but dost

moreover threaten with death those who do not eat, declaring, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, ye have not life in yourselves." Therefore trusting, though trembling on account of my weakness and need, and compelled by thy command, I who justly dread death because of my unworthiness, hope for life through thy great condescension. For, when I was not, thou didst by a word create me out of nothing. Thou thyself didst promise eternal life to those who faithfully believe on thee. Therefore, Lord Jesus, refresh me to-day with thy life-giving bread, the true manna, that was announced to us from heaven, conceived for us in Nazareth, born for us in Bethlehem, offered for us in Jerusalem, accepted in Calvary, sent unto us by God the Father,—the bread of angels. Strengthen my heart unto every good work, stir my memory with choice meditations upon thy life and thy works, enrich my intellect with true discernment of thy praises, kindle my will with ever perfect desires. In this manner, in this hope and confidence in thy graciousness, Lord Jesus, a trembling but trusting suppliant, I have drawn near to thy table, I have taken, I eat, I reflect. Do thou graciously revive my hunger, strengthen my infirmity, direct my folly, kindle my lukewarmness. For thou art by thy nature my God, by thy right my Lord, by thy graciousness my Father.

CHAPTER XVII

That we ought not to be dismayed if in Partaking we do not immediately experience Perfect Love of Christ—provided our Goodwill always excludes Wickedness and Malice.

Pious but faint-hearted souls need not be dismayed if

this bread does not forthwith reveal its entire efficacy in them by causing them at once to be fervent in love and ready for every good work or even to rejoice in tribulation. For it is living bread, a bread that sees, knows and discerns, quickening each individual in accordance with its own pleasure and choice and imparting its efficacy to him as it wills. Therefore if it should allow you to wallow in your weakness, do not on that account think that it is less gracious toward you. For even in the case of the apostles, the most friendly and kindly of the sons of God, men whom he ordained to establish as the pillars of the world, you see in what weakness, folly and vanity they were tossed hither and thither after partaking of the holy elements from Christ's own hands. For on that same night they all left him and fled. Peter denied him, and that holy company—one and all—strove and disputed with one another for the first place. Hence all faithful disciples, vain and weak though they may be, should put great faith in partaking of this holy communion, so long as their good will excludes wickedness and malice. To those who walk by faith a blessing, whether anticipated or bestowed, should possess the same value. For what difference does it make to you whether a gift has been presented or laid aside for you or bequeathed to you, if only it is yours? It was with faith that the disciples took of Christ's body at the Supper. For it thus pleased him to exercise their faith, although he did not bestow the Spirit that he promised them until the fiftieth day thereafter. Be not therefore weak, but in faith believe that this bread will quicken, when and so far as it shall will. For great shall be this life, this patient expectation exercised by your faith.

CHAPTER XVIII

That whoso truly proves himself and discerns the Lord's Body in Coming to the Sacrament in order to remedy his own Weakness, may approach it confidently and be assured of its Fruit.

The sacrament of the Eucharist is the bread of life, living and making alive, full of omnipotent strength, of the wisest knowledge, and of the most fruitful bounty and goodness to everyone that eateth not unworthily. He, however, eateth unworthily who either does not prove himself or does not discern the Lord's body. Now whoever recognizes and confesses his weakness or folly or barrenness proves himself. And he that perceives that in order to remedy these weaknesses he must have recourse to the life-giving bread discerns the Lord's body. Whoever therefore on the one hand thus proves himself and on the other hand thus perceives and discerns the Lord's body, however barren his mind may be in so doing, may come confidently and eat of the bread in the assurance that it will bear its true and efficacious fruit, and so meet his spiritual needs. For it is actually hay, grain, fodder, bread, food, a relish, a course, a banquet, a feast, a sacrifice; hay for pack animals, fodder for dumb beasts, grain for fatted cattle, bread for men, food for the weak, a feast for the renowned, a sacrifice for priests. This bread that was given to us out of heaven is become all things unto all creatures. For the Word was made flesh and hay and grain of corn and "food to the young ravens which cry" and bread to hungering men, food to the weak, a relish to the luxurious, a banquet to friends, a feast to princes, a sacrificial food to priests. It is a refreshment for the memory, to mark, remember, consider, contemplate, ponder and keep. It is bread for the intellect to distinguish, compare, discern, see, taste, admire, confess,

praise and extol. It is bread for which the will must long, which it must love, for which it must hunger and thirst and greatly desire and pine and faint with love, before which it must worship in deepest reverence and silent awe. Attention, meditation, reflection are functions of the memory; for one reflects in order to discern. Argumentation, assent, discernment belong to the intellect. Intuition, confidence, impulse or desire belong to the will. And it is only in this wise that this food threatens and is eaten, viz. by the mental acts of the three faculties of the soul.

CHAPTER XIX

That the Life-giving Flesh of Christ will efficaciously quicken us; and that in Partaking of it, just as we eat, so also we are eaten, and are ourselves made Part of his Body.

"My flesh is meat indeed" and the living bread; nay it is more life-giving than the tree of life, which in the beginning God planted in the midst of paradise. For that tree with its fruit could remove every weakness of the body and restore its former good health; and yet aside from bodily soundness it could cause and confer no forgiveness, no grace, no glory whatever. But this bread cleanses not only the flesh but also the spirit. The fruit of the tree could preserve carnal life. But this bread can rouse one out of bodily and spiritual death; it can quicken unto divine life even the soul, which is the life of the body; it can not only cure the body itself, but can also raise and strengthen and fashion the body of our humiliation like unto Christ's glorious body. For just as the soul and the love and wisdom and strength of Christ can enkindle, illumine and color our souls, so also his body

can establish, brighten and gladden our bodies. As our souls are refreshed by the abounding influences of spiritual bodies, by these, and influences still more potent Christ's body can be true meat and bread for our souls.

Moreover in partaking of the Eucharist we not only eat but also are eaten. For we take of it and are strengthened just as when we take and eat food; yet because this strengthening is effected not by any power of ours, but by the power of the bread we take, it transforms us into itself; and hence we say that we are eaten. It is just as when iron is made red hot, the iron absorbs the fire and yet is entirely possessed thereby. Hence the fire eats the iron and is also eaten by it. But mental changes are even more to the point; e.g. the pupil's faithful belief eats, so to speak, the teacher's wisdom; and the love of two lovers is fed by love.

CHAPTER XX

That the Body of Christ is the Bread of Life and likewise is the Bread of Angels; and since the Old Testament Saints while in the Wilderness did spiritually eat the Same Spiritual Food, the Flesh profiteth nothing.

"Man did eat the bread of angels." "This is the bread which cometh out of heaven." It came down out of heaven and became man. And since this is the Son of man, except a man eat of his flesh, except he eat of this bread, he hath not life in himself. Therefore in order that he may live forever, man must eat of this bread, the bread of angels. Hence even before the incarnation, both the angels and the saints of old did eat the same spiritual food in faith, hope and earnest expectation. They knew indeed from the very foundation of the building

that was designed to be the heavenly temple, that at the head of the corner there would be a certain stone, which would make both walls one building, a holy structure in the Lord. And because he announced and revealed it, bestowing his Spirit upon their hearts, they perhaps learned that this cornerstone was to be rejected by the builders. Hence, too, they learned of his suffering and obedience; of the name that was to be given him above every name; and of his exaltation. Therefore strengthened with this hope, they did eat the same spiritual food with us. Hence also strengthened by the blood of the Lamb they gained a victory in their warfare—concerning which I have written elsewhere,—see *De Dispensatione Verbi.*

And this bread giveth life to the world. For directly after the passage quoted above Christ adds: "I am the bread of life. He that cometh to me and believeth on me shall never hunger nor thirst." And further: "The flesh profiteth nothing, but it is the spirit that quickeneth," even the spiritual intellect, because "my words are spirit and are life. He that eateth me shall live because of me." Therefore if angels live because of him, they also eat him. For man eateth the bread of angels; therefore the angels eat the bread of man. He himself is the cornerstone uniting both walls in one corner. And this he does even more after laying aside the mystery of his incarnation, as is indicated by the words with which in reply to the murmuring Jews he said: "Doth this cause you to stumble? What then if ye should behold the Son of man ascending where he was before" on an equality with the Father? How are ye caused to stumble at hearing that ye are commanded to eat his flesh?

Hence before the incarnation, the angels did eat his flesh, even as did the Fathers in the wilderness through the spirit of the Son. For "the spirit quickeneth, but the flesh profiteth nothing." They that are in the same

house of God, angels and men, under one great priest share in the same victims and sacrifices and peace offerings,—and from the same altar. And unto the angels "flow rivers of living water from within him. But this spake he of the Holy Spirit, which they that believed on him were to receive." And since the angels received the spirit of the Son, they themselves are also the sons of God; and to God the Father, they cry "Abba, Father."

CHAPTER XXI

That Christ is as fully given to us in the Sacrament as he was broken for us in his Passion; and the more he was afflicted in his Passion the more is he given to us in the Sacrament.

Christ is thus as fully given to us in the sacrament as he was broken for us in his Passion; so that the offering which he then made on our behalf—provided we grow by continual remembrance of it—wholly avails for us, and becomes not his sacrifice but ours, not his righteousness or obedience but our own. We may draw near to the judgment-seat with boldness and confidence in our cause; for through that sacrifice we have become more pleasing to God than if we had never fallen. For just as the Apostle shows that if Christ died for all then all died, so it may also be shown that if Christ became obedient even unto death for all, then all became obedient even unto death; and if obedient, then righteous.

The Lord's body therefore was broken for us and his blood was shed unto remission of sins and unto the deliverance of the oppressed. His body was delivered unto his enemies to be conquered with complete victory in every kind of conflict with which they might assail him. This therefore is called the Lord's body and blood, because not

only his body and blood, but also his labor, lassitude, stripes, pain, grief, anguish, exhaustion, distress, weariness and loneliness of mind: all these were given—and that too perfectly—for us.

And in order that we may more thoroughly recognize this, we must see to what enemies he was completely delivered. It was to the most malignant devils and to their chief the Dragon, who above all thirsted for the blood of the Lamb. But to what extent was he delivered unto him? Surely to the extent of all that physical strength, which—however limited in flesh and blood—is characteristic of the glory of spirits, and closely corresponds to their mental superiority. Now this mental superiority existed in Christ to the highest degree. When therefore the Dragon with his natural sagacity clearly perceived it in him who was now delivered and abandoned to him, he undoubtedly essayed to overthrow this universal and complete preeminence on high with every insult before the kings of the earth. It was not therefore in physical suffering alone that he afflicted that holy soul but also in the suffering of the most extraordinary mental power which Christ's noble spirit aroused in his body. This power is not inappropriately called the ability to know, and the capacity to will. For ability and capacity are faculties, not of the intellect but of the body, for the purpose of understanding and willing.

Hence in order that his inner spirit alone, the purely inorganic man, might be preserved, his entire body with all its corporeal and organic powers, with everything within it, i. e. his body and blood together with his spirit and all its brilliancy, his nature and disposition, was completely delivered and abandoned to perfect suffering. But it was not abandoned to be conquered. Thus that it might become a perfect sacrifice of a sweet savor to the entire Trinity, who saw and approved of it, it was delivered on our behalf in time, but given to us for eternity. The

more it was delivered and abandoned for us, the more was it given to us. Moreover that we might possess a sufficient pledge of this eternal gift, it is also given to us in the sacrament, and not in imperfection or incompleteness, but as completely as he was perfectly given over to his enemies.

Now in order that you may realize how efficacious it is, consider first with what love, what ease, what generosity, what appropriateness, what kind condescension this is accomplished. What could be more loving than to be ever present with us? What could be easier than to accomplish this by a word? What more generous than to give oneself? What more appropriate than the use of wheaten bread and diluted wine? What more graciously condescending than to be near at hand to minister to all the necessities of "the little ones"? What therefore has surpassed this in love, ease, generosity, appropriateness and kind condescension? Surely then its effect is very great; even if we do not realize that though a lover may relish the budding of love, it is the fruit that attracts the maid he loves.

CHAPTER XXII

What Things have been given for us to consider in the Sacrament of the Eucharist; and what Effect we are to observe.

In the Eucharist, therefore, we find a generous gift, a just command, a truthful testimony. In the generous gift, we note the affection of the giver, the effect as shown in the greatness of the gift and the weakness or necessity of the recipient; in the command we see justice, facility and ensuing happiness; in the truthful testimony we have the authority and dignity of the speaker, the fitting harmony of his words, and the clearness and cogency of the truth.

Likewise the affection is whole-hearted, efficacious and

gladsome; the effect is beneficent, honorific and beatific; the weakness is characteristic of those who are exposed to the necessities arising from being debtors to nature's creation, to the difficulty of judging, choosing, performing, accomplishing and suffering; to vanity, folly, wickedness and malice.

To God we owe whatever is fitting; whatever he commands; and whatever we can do. It is fitting that we do right in return for his benefit, that we hold sacred our duties, and that we do the things that are worthy of his majesty. He commands us to obey the universal law of justice, honesty and love. We can manifest strict observance of his law, we can show diligence and earnestness; we can find time for our duties, we can display watchfulness and zeal.

To our neighbor we owe the charity that springs from pious affection, we owe edification and a good example, and assistance when aid is necessary. To ourselves we owe the penitence that is enjoined, even a pure purpose, true wisdom and a salutary zeal.

CHAPTER XXIII

What Confidence is given to the Faithful in the Sacrament of the Eucharist; and why Christ is given to us in it.

Great should be the confidence of all the faithful in the sacrament of the Eucharist, which has been given to them in order that they may know that Christ is accessible to their vows and prayers, since indeed he wished to be nigh in the body unto those who longed for him. For it was he, who in Judea, Galilee and Samaria listened to the cries and prayers of all, pitying the tears of those who besought him and fulfilling their desires. Nay even

when not invoked, he of his own accord often pitied and consoled the wretched. This then was the purpose for which he has been given in the sacrament at the altar by virtue of his office in the sacerdotal order. To the spiritually faithful he is also given—even in bodily presence—outside of the Eucharist and apart from the forms of bread and wine, since he is given to those who believe on him. For if none hath life except he eat his flesh and drink his blood, and on the other hand, he that believeth on him hath eternal life, it must obviously be admitted that everyone that believeth eateth his flesh and drinketh his blood.

Indeed in some respects spiritual communion is more fruitful than sacramental, at least in this respect, that in the former so far as the laity are concerned they both eat and drink, while in the latter they only eat,—unless by a blessed draught they are filled with spiritual peace. The latter is bound down by time and place, is permitted to certain persons only, and is compelled to observe a particular form; the former, springing from a pious heart in faith unfeigned rejects no age, no sex, no race, and is adapted to all places and all times. The latter is often harmful; the former is always fruitful and salutary.

CHAPTER XXIV

That one should at least come to the Sacrament with the First Step, i. e. of Remembrance; and even if he does not discern, he should at any rate remember Christ; and that even by Remembering one may eat corporeally.

When the Lord Jesus said, "As often as ye do this, do it in remembrance of me," he did not say "in reflection

upon me" or "discernment of me" or "pondering upon me" or "desire of me," but only—and this is the first step—"in remembrance of me." For unless one does it at least with remembrance of him he cannot do it with any deeper thought. Remembrance therefore is the result of one's eating and drinking; nay it is the proof that he truly eats. For Christ says, "Whenever two are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." I ask why he is in their midst. Is it because two are gathered together? Far from it; for the assemblies and gatherings of multitudes are hateful to God, when they "take counsel together against the Lord and against his anointed,"—not in his name but against it. Hence it is on account of his name that he is in their midst. Wherever therefore his "name is blessed from this time forth and forever more," wherever it "is to be praised from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same," however solitary and secluded the place, truly he is there, not only present by virtue of his divinity and because of his good will, but also corporeally present in all the beneficence of the power, skill and fruitfulness that has been bestowed upon flesh and blood throughout the world. Thus to one who remembers him, he is indeed the provision for every necessity along the journey, an antidote for poisons, an ointment for wounds, a laver for defilement, a covering for nakedness, an ornament for unsightliness, the bread of life and of every life, bread for the hungry and the wine of joy and gladness for all the thirsty.

I do not here say that any Christian whatsoever is able to secure his presence sacramentally through the Eucharist; that has been given only to priests. But I do say that to one who remembers his name, the Lord Jesus is truly present, not only in his deity, but also in his flesh and blood and entire humanity. For who can doubt that

the Lord Jesus is often bodily present with his faithful disciples in their last agonies,—though he does not on that account forsake his seat at the right hand of God in heaven? Who can doubt that this may simultaneously occur apart from the Eucharist as well as in it? Who can say that he does not burn—not merely with human love—but with the love of a mother, even a mother with child, for every individual for whom he suffered? For if Paul was again in the travail of affection until Christ should be formed in them, will not Christ, the Lord of Lords, their master and example, love them? If however he does love, can he be unsympathetic toward those he loves? And if he loves them so deeply that he is with child and in travail with them, that he nurses and nourishes them, that he has undoubtedly bestowed his presence upon the priestly order—defiled, corrupt and blasphemous as it often is,—must he not bestow it upon these the objects of his peculiar desire, love and zeal?

He has therefore bestowed it upon his "name that is to be praised from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same," i. e. in all places. He has bestowed it upon his "name that is blessed" at all times, "from this time forth and forever more." And what did he bestow upon his blessed name? That whosoever anywhere in his name makes remembrance of him, he himself in the body shall be present within him. So also he that remembers Christ is in him. For whenever a Christian through the inner man is in Christ, in both the outer and inner man Christ is always wholly present with him in the power of his gifts of grace, in the skill of his wisdom, in the fruitfulness of his generosity. What benefit that can be derived from conversation with men or from the reading of books can be compared with that which we obtain from this most holy and blessed name? All else is unfruitful

except in so far as it agrees and harmonizes with his most holy name.

Great then is the gain of those who meditate, ponder, seek and reflect on him, who taste of him, who hunger, long and pant for him, who love him, who pine with love and faint from pining for him, who has been given to them to supply their every need of power, skill and fruitfulness!

I do not think I am wrong in this opinion. If however I err, I regard the error as but slight, since it begets piety and will not be fruitless; and I know that I shall reap great benefit from remembering his name, even as Paul did not neglect any opportunity to serve Christ.

Great, I say, is the gain for those who, whenever they will, can have the presence of an omnipotent lover, who because he is such a lover, gratifies the wish of all of them! For since he is omnipotent, he knows how to gratify them in all things and he has the power to do so. He is very God; he himself is the priest that makes sacrifice, burns incense, makes peace, offers the first fruits and tithes and slaughters the victims in the fullness of his ministry and holiness; he himself is the sacrifice, the victim, the tithes. Whatever therefore one may ask of God, the Lord, the Father, the priest, the angel, prophet, king, master, shepherd, victim, sacrifice, first fruits, tithes, peace offerings, sacrifices, burnt offerings, incense and showbread,—of all this he may be assured from Christ's bodily presence through his blessed name that abounds in blessings. His name moreover is his memorial. His memorial consists in the remembrance of him. The remembrance of his marvelous works provides food for them that fear him, because he that gives them food, causes them to remember his marvelous works. Hence in so doing, he also gives food to them that fear him.

CHAPTER XXV

That in Commemorating Christ we even corporeally receive the Sacrament of his Body is Clear from the Words of the Blessed Ambrose.

This opinion of mine, in which I maintain that in commemorating Christ we not only have him present with us in the body to strengthen us, but that we even corporeally eat of him, is strongly confirmed by the words of Ambrose in his *De Verbis Dei*, where he in substance says: Just as Christ was offered once for all, so as often as sins are pardoned we take the sacrament of his body in order that through his blood the remission of sins may be given. Now this opinion of Ambrose contains a sublime thought, viz. that in the justification of an unrighteous man and in his revival from the death of sin those things are always granted which in the Dominican Order are deemed necessary for this change; i.e. the Holy Spirit is bestowed, and the Word that became flesh is given and is eaten. But how could this have taken place in the case of the Fathers of the Old Testament, who, although according to the interpretation of the lawgiver they did eat through their faith and longing, yet could not have eaten of Christ's flesh and blood in corporeal form, since it did not yet exist? It follows that they neither obtained deliverance from the bonds of their captivity nor full remission; unless perhaps we may say that God—by his own gift of himself—made liberal and full remission for them and that thus they truly lived by the spirit. Yet since in the most just dispensation of divine righteousness God had established the glory of his kingdom upon the judgment of the wise, it was to be expected that he would reestablish this requisite for salvation through the Word that became flesh.

CHAPTER XXVI

That since through Eating we fell, it is Fitting that through Eating we should be restored to God's Favor; and that the Lord Jesus drank of the Cup which he offered.

In sacrificial rites eating and refreshment were almost always conjoined with the offering; and therefore for Christians the highest sacrifice is to be found in eating. Even the Lord Jesus drank of the cup that he offered for a sweet savor. And this is fitting in our restoration to God's favor, since we fell by eating. Besides the life and nourishment of the soul is love. And nothing reflects the light of love so much as the contemplation of the body and blood of Christ, whereby the Father gave the Son, whom he loved even as himself. Indeed if it had been fitting, he would rather have given himself. So also was it with the Holy Spirit. Love of such worth must needs provide the best food. This sacrament therefore is food and drink, a remedy and cure suited to every disease. To take this spiritually is to become accustomed to reflect worthily upon it, and so to esteem its value that greater longing and love will be enkindled. It was thus that Anthony and the Macarius brothers were wont to do. When we receive the sacrament, we must piously believe that the Lord Jesus is not only spiritually but corporeally present in accordance with the word that was quoted above, "Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Nor is this inconsistent; for, if he is sacramentally present in several places he can do more wonderful things than these without a miracle. Nay after the resurrection we too will be able to do what only the angels can do now. For our bodies will be fashioned after Christ's glorified body. One soul

which lifts a hand here, lowers it there. My angel assists me; he persuades another to go against me. The Lord Jesus, when he appears to the blessed, is not supposed to have left the right hand of the Father, nor does he any longer appear to an angel.

CHAPTER XXVII

Propositions by Wessel, taken from the Gospel, concerning Partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ; of what Advantage it is to those who partake; and concerning its Truth.

1. The words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life, i. e. being understood spiritually and not carnally, they bestow life.

2. For the spirit quickeneth the inner man, while carnal understanding profiteth nothing.

3. And because certain among you are carnal, these do not believe the words that quicken spiritually.

4. I have known from the beginning who will not believe, and who shall betray me after they have believed.

5. Whosoever believeth on me hath eternal life.

6. Everyone that hath eternal life—I will raise him up at the last day, but to a higher life, in comparison with which this present life is death.

7. Everyone that beholdeth the Son and believeth on him hath eternal life.

8. Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves.

9. He that believeth on me shall never thirst. Therefore to believe is to drink his blood.

10. I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger.

11. Hence to come to him is to eat. All that which

the Father giveth me shall come unto me: therefore he eateth his flesh and drinketh his blood.

12. No man cometh to me except my Father draw him. Therefore when the Father draweth him, he eateth and drinketh. To be drawn is surely to hear and to learn.

13. Everyone that heareth from my Father and learneth from him, cometh to me.

14. Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he that is from God, he seeth the Father. That man seeth, whom, when he speaketh, we believe.

15. He that believeth, drinketh the word of him that preacheth and is fed by him.

16. Anyone that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out.

17. He that cometh to me shall never hunger.

18. Because of your unbelief have I said unto you that no man can come unto me, except it be given unto him of my Father.

19. Many therefore went back because they did not believe. Would ye also go away, not believing?

20. And Peter answered, "To whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life." (Cf. 1st and 2nd.)

21. "And we have believed and know that thou art the Christ, the son of the living God."

22. Therefore ye have eternal life. (Cf. 5th and 6th.) Therefore ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood. Therefore I will raise you up at the last day.

23. All that which the Father giveth me shall come unto me. And this is the will of my Father that sent me, that of all that which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day.

24. This is the will of my Father that sent me, that everyone that beholdeth the Son and believeth on him,

should have eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.

25. I am come down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me, i. e. that they should come to the Son, should not perish, should not be lost, but should have life, believing on him.

26. The Son of man giveth the food that abideth unto eternal life: except ye believe, ye shall not have life abiding in yourselves.

27. I am the living bread; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: yea, and the bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. This is the bread which cometh down out of heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves.

28. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up.

29. My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me, and I in him. Take, therefore, and eat ye all of it. This is my body. This do, as often as ye eat it, in remembrance of me, diligently considering what hath been placed before you, discerning the Lord's body that was broken for you, and show the Lord's death. For by eating, remembering, considering, discerning, reflecting, tasting, hungering, longing, esteeming, loving, pining and fainting with love, we shall be quickened, strengthened, enkindled with love for the living God, so that we shall abide and live in him.

30. I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live.

31. And whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die. Therefore by believing on him, a man eateth and feedeth upon his flesh and drinketh his blood.

32. For except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves.

33. But by believing on him, though they die, yet shall they live and shall not die forever.

34. For the righteous shall live by faith, not by bread, but by the word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.

35. By this word he quickeneth them that believe, he cleanseth them that progress. For by faith he purifieth them, he cleanseth their hearts, he washeth and maketh pure them that love him, he delighteth them that love him, he enkindleth the perfect.

CHAPTER XXVIII

How we work for the Food that perisheth not; and Believing in Christ is the Work of the Food that perisheth not; and he that believeth, liveth, and, living by Faith, is raised up at the Last Day.

1. "Work for the food that perisheth not." Note the words: "Work for the food." And he adds the sort of food for which they ought, and for which he wishes them, to work, viz. "the food which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of man shall give unto you: for him, the Father, even God, hath sealed."

2. Hence we work for the food with the seal of the Father. But how can we work with the seal except by transacting business under the seal in its lawful use?

3. And what lawful use is there in the seal, but believing? For seals are employed to serve as proofs, and to be trusted as reliable. Even the multitude seems to have understood it in this way—though not perfectly—when they replied by asking what they must do to work the works of God. But that they might know more clearly,

he clearly explained how they were to work for the food that would not perish, saying:

4. That this was the work of God, that they should believe on him whom God sent.

5. Therefore, to know God and Jesus Christ whom God hath sent, this it is to work for the food that perisheth not.

6. For this is the will of him who sent me, even the Father, that everyone that beholdeth the Son and believeth on him, should have eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. He already believes and has eternal life.

7. How then will he raise us up to life, unless this present life of faith is as death, compared to a second life? The lamp light is a kind of light. But compared with the light of the rising day star, it is darkness. And the light of the rising day star, compared with the dawning day, is darkness. And the dawning day, compared with the rising sun, is darkness. But the last day will be one of the most perfect light. And when we shall wake at that light, we shall be raised up as it were from death.

8. The faith of them that believe is a small seed of that life.

9. Verily I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath eternal life.

10. I am the bread of life.

11. Hence by believing on him, we work for the food that perisheth not; in the meantime, however, we work for it on the way.

12. But we shall work more for it by seeing, esteeming, etc. in the fatherland.

13. Your fathers ate the manna, and they died: because they did not partake of the refreshment, as it were, of the inner man.

14. This is the living bread which cometh down out of heaven.

15. If a man eat thereof, he shall not die. I am the living bread which came down out of heaven.

16. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever.

17. And the bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world.

18. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in yourselves.

19. For the life in his blood, with all the fullness of his sanctification, constitutes blood, i. e. flesh; since man's blood, or flesh, is the real life of his existence.

20. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life.

21. And I will raise him up at the last day. Therefore he is still, in a certain sense, lying dead and buried.

22. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.

23. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him.

24. This occurs, however, only if hungering and thirsting, he panteth for the fullness of grace and truth.

25. But he that saith he abideth in Christ, ought also to walk even as he walked.

26. As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father,

27. So he that eateth me, he also shall live because of me.

28. He eateth, who tasteth that he is sweet.

29. Thus did Magdalene eat, when she sat at the feet of Jesus,

30. When at first she loved much, and when in anointing him she wrought a good work.

31. She was scourged with his stripes, she was reproached with his reproaches;

32. Nay, more than if she had been reproached herself.

33. She was crucified with his wounds. In his death she died with him from bitter grief.

34. She rejoiced with him in his victory over death, and exulted in his triumph.

35. In all this she ate the flesh of the Son of man and drank his blood, and therefore lives indeed forever.

36. To partake of his body and blood, this is to eat more than if with parched heart and frigid will (even though in a state of grace) we partake of the eucharist ten thousand times at the altar from the hand of a priest.

37. For he that loveth much, worketh much for the food that perisheth not.

38. For even as the life of the inner man consists in wisdom, glory and love, so of necessity the inner man must be nourished by such things.

39. For we consist of the things by which we are nourished.

40. But, since we have no true way to perfect wisdom, glory and love but by the wisdom, glory and love, which the Lord Jesus showed in the flesh; so, except we eat the flesh of the Son of man, we shall not work for the food that perisheth not, nor shall we have life in ourselves.

CHAPTER XXIX

That Metaphorical Words have the Same, though Amplified, Force as Literal Words; and that by Philosophizing upon All the Works of God we may be fed.

Metaphorical words have the same, though amplified, force as literal words. Hence when Paul says, "Our Fathers did eat the same food," he assumes that to eat is to be spiritually affected; and because this is a mental process, he extends it to include alternate differences of

time. For, inasmuch as the Lord's body did not yet exist, the Fathers could not eat of it corporeally. In like manner to-day all the laity drink of the Lord's blood. For if the Fathers drank the same spiritual draught, much more evidently do men of our day drink of it.

If, however, we had open eyes, we would not merely eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, which with regard to the great works of God consists in worthy remembrance, reflection, discernment, comparison, meditation, seeing, tasting and desiring; but by philosophizing upon these works we would be fed, so that we might eat iron and sand and stones. For John explicitly says that all things were made through the Word, and since this took place through the Word of uncreated wisdom and there was life in the Word, it is the light of men. Hence whatever was made through the Word was not only worthy to be made, but was so sublime in the Word that it makes alive anyone who apprehends things in the Word, and illuminates him with wisdom; for the life was the light of men.

Such clearness of vision goes far beyond the natural limit of the mind, which knows the objects of creation only in themselves. Hence this clearness of vision is twofold. There is a certain vision in blessed spirits that are released from the body here on earth, whose natural horizon is greatly enlarged by their comprehension of things in the Word. There is another vision which belongs to the body that is to be resumed by us and fashioned after the glorified body of Jesus. In all things therefore it is possible to suck honey from the rock, and oil from the stone, and find manna upon the face of the earth, and wine,—provided however one has open eyes and ardent desire. For if the invisible things of God, being preserved through those things that are made, have been seen to no purpose by philosophers who remained barren in spite of it, why

cannot a prudent and faithful servant through these invisible things find the same God, the Lord, the Father,—such a Father as will adopt him as his son? Therefore God gives himself to be our Father and the eternal Son to be our brother and the Holy Spirit to be the gift of love that he bestowed, in order that he himself may be our reward, food, feast, offering, wine, treasure, kingdom, lover, life, eagerness, joy, gladness, exultation and blessedness. Our love toward God will accomplish all this for us at his hands. Nay what is there that has not been given for the accumulation of riches unto him that hath open eyes, since the necessities of poverty and weakness, nakedness of the body, and all the causes of hunger, thirst and weariness are to him the means of wisdom and righteousness? For certain conditions are necessary to us in order to remind us that we must seek even the breath of life. Nakedness is always unseemly. Raggedness is always productive of shame. Hunger, thirst, weariness, wakefulness, sickness, are always irksome, in order that we may be urged to seek bread and wine, the bread of salutary wisdom, beautiful clothing, the wine of spiritual delight and a blessed sleep and rest in the embrace of our beloved. These hardships therefore have not been inflicted to torment us, but have been appointed to serve as warnings to us if we are wise; so that as often as we suffer them, we may be reminded to seek true blessings.

O Wisdom! How precious are the hidden things which thou dost reveal! How like a father thou art, in that even while angry with us, thou dost give us the help which is our heritage!

FARRAGO

Rerũ Theologicarum uberrima, doctissimo uiro VVESSELO Groningensi Autore.

IN HOC LIBRO TRACTATVR.

I De benignissima dei prouidẽtia, oia suauiter disponẽte.
II De causis, mysterijs, & effectibus dominicæ incarnationis & passionis.
III De dignitate & ptãte ecclesiastica. De ucra obedientia. Et quãtũ obligẽt mãdata & statuta prælatorũ.
IIII De sacramento pœnitentiæ, & quæ sint claues ecclesiæ. De potestate ligandi & soluendi.
V Quæ sit uera cõmunio sanctorum. De thesauro ecclesiæ, De participatione & dispensatione huius thesauri. De Fraternitatibus, &c.
VI De purgatorio, quis & qualis sit ignis purgatorius De statu & profectu animarũ post hanc uitã, &c.
VII De eisdẽ ferè rebus, ciusdẽ eruditæ aliquot epistolæ

The Title-page of the Wittenberg Edition of the Farrago

The Farrago

I

Concerning the Sure and Benign Providence of God which Operates in and Graciously Orders All Things

CONCERNING THE SURE AND BENIGN PROVIDENCE OF GOD WHICH OPERATES IN AND GRACIOUSLY ORDERS ALL THINGS

If in the light of faith we carefully examine the agencies which operate, act and produce, we shall readily arrive at the proposition of Proclus, that "not only does a first cause produce an effect more than any secondary cause, but that all other causes are only contingent, the first alone being necessary to establish the effect." This has indeed been thus expressed by the Prophet:—"For thou art the glory of their strength,"—as if he said: "Their strength being created would have no glory, if thine unchangeable will did not supplement and direct it." This is clear also from the incident of the fiery furnace in Babylon, where the great heat of the fire, even when intensified by oil, did not consume the three Hebrews. And yet if it had been his pleasure, God by an exercise of the same will could have commanded the mild warmth of the Eastern sun to burn with a fiercer heat than the oil in the fiery furnace.

Now from this we readily see the truth of Plato's statement that nature is nothing else than the will of God acting with regularity, while a miracle is an extraordinary operation of the divine will. It follows therefore that every operating cause is nothing else than God operating, or the cooperating of the cause with God.

Thus even in the Father's house there exist vision, judgment and fruition. Yet these are acts (*actus*) produced by God in the blessed spirits, although, being the

concurrent product of the habitual light of his glory and perfect love, they are apparently the result of non-essential causes. For God, in his own good pleasure, can make these acts even more perfect out of imperfect habits (*habitus*) and favorable acts out of unfavorable habits; or rather he can make these acts altogether beneficent in themselves by his own absolute power. And thus he himself is to be the light of glory to their vision, the standard of judgment to their intelligence, the spark of fruition to their will. But inasmuch as the Apostle says "love never faileth," obviously one must admit that either their habit of love will abide forever or their act of fruition is indeed the most perfect love.

HOW WORKS OF ART MAY BE INVESTED WITH LIFE

In order that any artistic production may truly live, i. e. may properly represent vivifying art, it must be made the subject of reflection. For unless one discovers what the artist purposes to portray, the work of art is inert and dead. If an ape should happen to enter the workshop of a woodcarver, the axe, the pick, the plane, the saw, the hammer, the joint, the rule, the compasses would all be fruitless, barren, empty, and therefore dead things to him. And they would be equally so to a man of inert mind. In order to understand and enjoy what the workman purposed, one must give his work due reflection. Now the whole creation from its highest point to its lowest is the work of divine art. This is evident from the systematic and complete order that prevails in it, causing philosophers to observe that all things have been arranged in related forms (*species*) just as is the case with numbers. And a man is dull in so far as he does not perceive the purpose of the Supreme Artist in the world about him. Hence to a wise man the whole creation is an expression

of the Divine Artist, demanding reflection, just as to an intelligent observer works of art are the expression of artists, requiring reflection. If, therefore, the inspection of a work of art does not reveal its purpose, it will not present a complete and inner image of itself, or reveal itself perfectly; hence it will not fully express its meaning.

GOD RULES COMPLETELY AND CAUSALLY IN ALL THINGS

To such an extent is the Lord God the ruler of the universe that not only are all things done in accordance with his will but indeed by the exercise of his will. Unless he wills it, they can not be done, no matter how powerful may be the causes operating through nature. Other cooperating causes therefore are neither complete nor principal causes, but God rules as the entire, the chief cause of all things. He rules, I say, because knowing, appointing, and willing, he completely and essentially causes things to exist. He causes them to exist and preserves them according to his good pleasure without any change in himself, which no other cause can do. For by the simple exercise of his will, whatever is done would be done even if there were no secondary causes. Thus it would appear that all other causes should be termed —not so much causes—as occasions, unless the words of faith be misconstrued. Such is the word of the Master at the Supper:—"He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do." Therefore in the greater works of salvation believers cooperate with God in his operations. In this life by believing, fixing our gaze upon him, loving him, we may truly cooperate with God. And in this God makes us cooperate, because without him we can do nothing; but we can do all things in him, that strengtheneth us. For through him it is given us both to will and to do.

In that cooperation on our part lies our sin or our piety.

For we act in accord with him in his operations; and this accord is due both to the grace of God and to ourselves,—to ourselves inasmuch as we operate; to God, inasmuch as he operates principally and completely.

Shrouded in dense darkness and hidden deep from the sight of all are the judgments of God which are to be revealed in that clear day of the last judgment, when all who are to be judged, being themselves the judges, will clearly perceive that God's judgments are true and righteous altogether. Concerning which the holy Apostle Paul has taught us here to cry: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments!"

In that day, whether he will or not, the king over all the sons of pride will in the presence of all decide that he has been justly condemned, because he will there render an account of his every word and wish. He will render an account when in accordance with reason, i. e. conscience, he will reflect upon the truth that makes for his judgment. Compare II. Peter II. 4, "cast into chains he delivered them to be tortured and to be reserved unto judgment." If they are reserved unto judgment, they are reserved to render an account; if for every idle word, then for every blasphemous word. Then into the eye of his sublime pride will fall that consuming fire which will not be extinguished to all eternity. For he will suffer everlasting reproach, which for him shall never be blotted out. That account he will by no means be able to evade, an account clearer than the noonday light to be rendered in the presence of all. Never is the brightness of the sun so hateful to weak eyes as the blazing, clear necessity of rendering an account will be to his contumacy. No fire of hell will be more consuming to him than that effulgence and splendor. For that necessity will fall straight into the pupil of his proud eye.

FRANCIS PENETRATED INTO THE SECRETS OF NATURE

With the eye of wide and deep reflection, Francis penetrated into the secrets of nature when he embraced the whole creation in fraternal affection, calling the fire his brother, and the lark his sister, and both heat and sun his brothers, as having all sprung from the same God and Father. Therefore he dared not assert dominion over them, but presumed only to ask aid of them. Now such awe on the part of reverent souls will be increased, if we see God operating in all things:—in the fire, causing heat; in the sun, shining, glowing, warming, germinating, with the result that we feel, not so much that created things are subservient to us, as that the Creator by his authority provides all things for us. If we attentively observed this in all things, we would not so arrogantly claim sovereignty for ourselves. This constant feeling of true reverence is suppressed, choked and destroyed by those who think that God has so ordered things that they act of themselves, and not God in them; since God nevertheless exists in their action, even as light exists in color that glows white or red.

Current opinion, as well as some passages of Scripture, seems to be sharply at variance with the intent of the Lord Jesus, when he tells us to cast all our anxiety and care and thought on God, our Lord and Father; for he careth for us. For one must admit that it is the good field and the good tree that produce the good fruit. Yet this contradiction is readily resolved, if we rid ourselves of the idea of "causes" and substitute "occasions," so that God becomes the real agent in all things, and the only creative agent, i. e. he so operates in every outward action of his creatures that, whether secondary causes cooperate or not, whenever he efficaciously wills that something be done, the effect always follows. And if he does not thus

exert his will, nothing will result, no matter how great the natural force and zeal exerted by other powers. And therefore though secondary causes may be true causes, still in comparison with the first cause they are to be regarded as mere occasions, so that indeed all our care and thought may fittingly and wisely be cast on him. Still secondary causes are really cooperating causes in accordance with the word:—"He that believeth on me the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do." But he shall do them in dependence upon God's action; for apart from him we can do nothing.

NATURE IS NOTHING ELSE THAN THE WILL OF GOD

If nature is nothing but the will of God regulated by the law of uniformity, and miracle is the will of the same God exerted in some unusual manner, it is clear that nature is to be distinguished from miracle not by a difference of causes, but only by the difference between the usual and the unusual. For truly it is not by natural causes that anything exists, but by the will of God. And in no other sense should we trust nature, asserting, for example, that long life depends upon sound constitution or good diet or countless remedies.

In reality the Babylonian furnace of itself did not burn the Chaldeans any more than it cooled the Hebrews; the water of itself did not drown the Egyptians any more than it served as a wall for the Hebrews. Both water and fire act at the command of God. Therefore if he willed it, the rocks would pour forth water as the clouds do now, and the clouds would stand as firm as do the jutting crags now. This is true in the domain of nature. And it is likewise true in matters relating to the reason, although only so far as they are originally from God and inasmuch as it is necessary that his will be always fulfilled. Never-

theless, since after having created man he has ordinarily left him to the control of his own judgment, he evidently did not wish that everything resulting from man's will should be directly referred to Him as the entire cause of it. But will not he who created man without man's assistance save him without his aid? Strange to say, although a man's destruction is the result of his own action, yet his salvation is due entirely to the will of God.

God's will, therefore, is the book of life in which are enrolled all the sons of God, and not one of that blessed number shall perish. This is attested by the statement of the Lord, quoting Moses:—"Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." For the word of God, by which every man lives, is the light and life of men. Indeed it is the life of all living creatures.

And let no one be troubled because of the distributive phrase, "by every word," when there is but one Word. For the distributive expression is used not on account of the number of the words, but for verbal variety. Just as the Apostle James speaks distributively when he says:—"Every good gift and every perfect gift." And yet there is but one gift, according to the testimony of Esaias, who says:—"Unto us a Son is given"; and there is but one Holy Spirit proceeding as a gift from the everlasting Father. For the Son has been given to us in manifold forms, as saviour, redeemer, liberator, healer, teacher, defender, bridegroom. Likewise the Holy Spirit is a gift in many forms.

NOT A SPARROW IS FORGOTTEN BEFORE GOD

"Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings, and not one of them is forgotten before your Father in heaven?" Therefore he is always mindful of the sparrows which

he has created, fed and directed; and so controlled that not one of them has fallen to the ground without the Father's will. Indeed not a leaf falls from a tree without his will.

Obviously some great thing is stored away and concealed in what God has created, something that in the beginning was under man's control and for some lofty use. But this was before the curse that followed man's transgression of his command. For great indeed must have been those gifts so beneficently entrusted in the exercise of wisdom and glory and love to man, the son of God. And to-day the angels, reflecting upon the greatness of these gifts, cry and shout aloud that "heaven and earth are full of God's glory."

Nor is this surprising on the part of the blessed angels, since God himself, who regarded things as worthy of his creative workmanship, also regarded them as worthy of his control. Hence he, who can forget nothing, regards them as worthy to be remembered.

Therefore he who does not forget the flying sparrows nor the leaves torn from the trees by the wind, forgets nothing. He does not forget our idle words, no, nor our foolish, venomous, pernicious words any more than our useful, wholesome, holy words.

However faithfully and carefully a farmer may sow his field, the sweat of his brow counts for nothing unless God from heaven bless his work. But after the seed is sown he does not expect a blessing from heaven alone; he expects it because he has a fertile farm, because he has the seed, the beasts of burden and agricultural implements, because he has his limbs and strength and willingness to endure. In a word, what he is and has is altogether due to the beneficence of God; for in the last analysis both we and all our possessions are from God. But although God is the source of all things, still he wishes the farmer to labor

through these agencies,—and this to such an extent that although God himself does it all, no blessing, no fruit will attend a lazy, snoring farmer.

It follows that in cultivating the field of the soul, while God creates and does all things himself, nevertheless he wishes his husbandmen to cooperate with him and count for much in so doing.

EXCEPT THE LORD BUILD THE HOUSE, THEY LABOR IN VAIN THAT BUILD IT

After working and building, after watching and guarding, we must admit that it would be all in vain, if divine aid did not direct, sustain and carry out our efforts to the result at which we aim. Nevertheless we must watch and guard, though we know it counts for nothing. But besides knowing and admitting this, we must trust that he will guard us, and beg and beseech him in mercy not to leave us unguarded. We must thank him for not letting us fall into the teeth of our enemies, and must admit that if the Lord had not been in us when the devils rose against us, they would certainly have swallowed us up. For the Lord wishes us to consider our own work of no value, however great it may be through him, so that if we do not succeed we may still feel obligated to him, and if we do succeed our humility may gratify him. For he who consumes sinners shows favor to the humble.

WHOEVER FIRST STEPPED DOWN INTO THE POOL AFTER THE TROUBLING OF THE WATER WAS MADE WHOLE

There is no doubt that each one was eager to be the first to enter the pool, because he was longing to be made whole. But his eager longing engendered struggle and strife. More than that it soon produced contention and hatred. Yet each one ought so to have loved God as to

submit all his longing to be cured to the divine will, not desiring to be healed otherwise.

Hence, although this miracle, the healing of the first man to step into the pool, did indeed stir up strife among those who were depraved, in the case of those who were reasonable it was a test of their love of God.

"If God doth so clothe the grass of the field which to-day is and to-morrow is cast into the oven, how much more shall he clothe you, O ye of little faith"—in the outward man, but especially in the inward man? For he, who fashioned the outward for the sake of the inward, sees fit to care painstakingly for the outward and bring it to perfection, even to the last and least detail, e. g. to the fall of the leaves. How feeble then is our faith, how little our confidence, if we do not believe that, if we ask him he will grant us the furnishing of the inward man, so that we may walk in white before his presence;—if we ask him, I say, who rejoices to be asked and invoked by us as our Father! Therefore he will clothe the inward man with choice meditations, with correct judgments, with perfect desires.

And what meditations are more choice than those concerning the Lord Jesus? What judgments more correct than those in accord with his teaching? What desires more perfect than to make return for his love?

Surely, he will gladly give us the white raiment of the inward man, if we ask him, who is our Father in heaven. For even when we did not ask him, nay when we stood aloof from him and obstinately repelled him, he sent us his Word and made us whole.

REFLECTIONS UPON SLEEPING AND SLEEP

Until I looked closely into the matter, I was greatly disturbed by reflections upon sleeping and sleep, a state in which the mind does not work at all, but lies altogether

idle, weighed down and overcome thereby, like some dumb animal. Indeed it seemed to me that in this connection Aristotle's conception of the mind was more closely approached by Alexander than by Themistius. Alexander was of the opinion that the intellect in itself is organic, as is sight, or any sense common to us all. For do not the intellect and the will seem to be organic, since they are thus arrested and rendered inactive by sleep just exactly as is our sight or hearing? Hence it may be concluded by a seemingly effective argument that the intellect knows nothing except by perceiving external appearances, and these appearances are the ultimate images of all our sensations. But it is foolish to say that the intellect is limited to the knowledge of these appearances. For it takes the keenest delight in apprehending very many things, not one of which can be an appearance, but must consist of thought apart from appearances. And since these abstractions cannot be apprehended by means of any corporeal image, they cannot be apprehended by any organic corporeal faculty. Such things are knowledge, wisdom, love, justice, piety.

Now if these are truly apprehended by the intellect without the aid of any corporeal organic faculty, it must be admitted that, when all our senses are profoundly asleep, virtue, which is also inorganic, can be rendered inactive, so that the mind can neither apprehend anything wisely, nor desire anything justly, nor esteem nor love anything. When we awake, we do not know that we have entertained any of these feelings or emotions during the interval of sleep. Hence there must be a deeper cause of this inactivity,—a cause which is to be traced out, not by means of the philosophy of this age, but by the aid of a pious faith. And that cause is the free will of God cooperating or not cooperating with us, as revealed in the uncreated light of his countenance, whereby we are sealed.

For just as the spirit bloweth where and when it listeth, and we know that the impulse of the heart is caused by it, though its coming, its action, its going are governed, not by our choice but by its own; so it is with our intellect. For as the eye of the body, when deprived of the corporeal light of the sun, does not see anything, so our intellect, when deprived of the light of God's countenance, is rendered, so to speak, wholly inactive. Not only are we destitute of this light when sleeping, but also often, when we are awake, we are so stupid, so dull, that we actually find that our minds are inactive. And yet sometimes we are made keen, so that we may even penetrate hidden mysteries. Hence, just as the will of that uncreated light renders one man wiser than another or more inactive or more productive, so also it makes the same man more keen or more dull than if left to himself.

Nor need one be troubled by the fact that the inactivity of the mind during sleep is so regular as to appear to be a result of nature. True faith in God will readily discover that ours is a smooth and plain way of explaining that fact, where neither Alexander, the keenest, nor Aristotle, the prince of the Peripatetics, found a way. For since, according to them, the active intellect (*intellectus agens*) illuminates mental images by a light derived from its own nature, it ought to illuminate them just as much when we are asleep as when we are awake. Moreover it is strange that Aristotle who strongly believed that the potential intellect (*intellectus possibilis*) must be roused by the action of light, does not rouse the will by the action of fire, unless possibly he thought it sufficient for the will to be roused and stirred to action by sapiential reason. But all this is akin to the error of those who think that, since the reason is right, the will is always right. For, if that be so, the will would not be free any more than the intellect

is now. Alexander indeed deprives man of this his highest honor and dignity, and extinguishes all the divinity existing in him. Nor should one be disturbed because the Apostle, I. Cor. II. seems to support the blessed Thomas and Aristotle, when in speaking of the wisdom of God hidden in mystery, which none of the princes of this world have known, he adds conditionally: "For had they known it, they would never have crucified the King of Glory." Now, if this is true, it must needs be that they could not have known and yet opposed it. Since however the Apostle's statement is conditional, it makes true wisdom depend upon the cooperation of the Spirit, which voluntarily assists and gently kindles and excites the will. And as regards this infallibility of man's reason, the *Parisian Article* is not properly understood. For those who have the spirit of the Son make right decisions and have just desires. Indeed—what is more important—the Apostle seems to have been concerned with the wisdom of those who have attained rather than those still on the way. For the statement that follows seems to point to this when it adds:—"As it has been written: Eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." But these words may properly, though not so pertinently, be also interpreted in their relation to the wisdom of wayfarers, to commend which the passage of Scripture is quoted.

WESSEL'S OPINION OPPOSED TO ARISTOTLE'S CONCERNING THE ACTIVE INTELLECT (*Intellectus agens*)

Now if my opinion, as opposed to Aristotle's, concerning the active intellect is true,—an opinion which is confirmed by many passages of Holy Writ, as for example:—"And the life was the light of men," (of men, I say, as they are

now),"and that light shines in our darkness," even when we do not receive him; if, I say, my opinion is true no less than Aristotle's statement that "since the light of the active intellect is unerring, it shines in men even when they are in error,"—for I hold that the potential intellect, apart from the active intellect, results in no more activity than sight or the eye apart from light.—

Furthermore, if my opinion as opposed to Aristotle is confirmed by the following considerations: First, that Aristotle's arguments to prove that the active intellect is a power of the soul are not so conclusive as to prevent his own commentator, Averroes, from locating the active intellect really outside oneself, and from concluding that, although in its actual operation the active intellect, which as a device of the Philosophers is represented as emanating from the sun's light, in reality differs from it in color and visual power, yet, in order to see, it must be united with it, and to produce an effect must be combined with it, like causes essentially related to each other; Second, that Aristotle, being ignorant of Holy Writ and therefore failing to recognize the light of God's countenance stamped upon us, put our deepest intelligence in place of the intellectual Sun and the universal active intellect; Third, that while it is true that pure intelligences, i. e. angels, inasmuch as they possess hierarchic dominion over us, can illumine our darkness, yet they cannot do so unless illuminated by their Sun; for they are like mirrors, made of gold, silver or other metals, rubbed and polished, which being indeed resplendent with light, shine of themselves; not however by their own light, but by the brightness of the light falling upon them, for the light of the sun is in itself the primal source of light in all visible objects:

If these things are true, and they must be true, we conclude that since it is always best to reduce things to their

simplest elements, it is not necessary to superadd some natural power to the intellect. And it follows that just as God is the light of the potential intellect, causing it to comprehend, so also he is the standard of all values, the highest measure of intelligence, the first spark of the will, the primal energizing cause. If, I say, these things are true, and they cannot be false, who is there that cannot see how widely the face of Scripture is illuminated and clarified by this single truth?

Indeed, inasmuch as from this the chief commandment of the Law at once begins to be clear,—in that it is most reasonable that we should desire, esteem, love our Sun, our light, our vital heat with all our heart, spirit, soul, mind, intelligence, will, esteem and love, it must be that all the Law and the Prophets, nay even the Sacred Page as a whole, will be illuminated by this one truth,—and this, not only that we may understand it but render prompter obedience to it. For who, on recalling that he can do nothing by his own reflections, desires or decisions unless that inward Sun shines and directs and leads him,—who, I say, recalling this, can exalt himself or be exalted over others? For truly remembering that he possesses nothing which he has not received from God, nothing which he does not receive from him from moment to moment, and nothing which he will not always thus receive from him, he will never boast as if he did not receive it; nor will he readily spurn anyone, even if he sees that he has not received as much, because "the same Lord, rich toward all," is able to give to that one even as he gives to him; he will readily humble himself under the omnipotent hand of God; he will be disposed to accept his promise of favor voluntarily offered to the humble.

What more shall I say? Constant thought and frequent reflection upon this truth will open a short and straight path to every human blessing. But woe to thee, O hard-

ness of my heart, which neither these things nor those noted above can soften! And though in reflecting upon them, I know that my God and my Lord is my father and mother in all the vital relations of parent and son, I know that the Word incarnate is my brother and sister, I know and admit that the eternal Spirit of the Father and the Son is my friend, my beloved; in spite of this, I am cold, dull, and devoid of affection! Yet to some degree I console myself with the word: "Blessed are those who mourn."

CONCERNING CONSCIENCE AND REASON

Therefore what Aristotle calls the active intellect I call the light of God's countenance. What he says concerning conscience and reason pleading for the best things, I ascribe, not to any power of the soul or to the natural state of the soul, but rather to the breath of life breathed into man by divine power, and to divine assistance not only for the will but also for intelligence.

THE MEASURE OF HUMAN LIFE DEPENDS NOT UPON NATURE, BUT SOLELY UPON THE WILL OF GOD

The opinion I hold concerning the quickening union of body and soul is this; that when the body has been molded by divine power, whether as in the case of Adam in paradise or in the mother's womb, the soul is not produced out of the power of matter through some inherent force, but the breath of life is breathed into the body by divine power alone. And just as this union depended upon God alone at the beginning, so its continuance and preservation even to the end is attributable solely to him. Hence unless he who united body and soul separates them, they cannot be separated or severed from each other.

If, I say, these things, which are probable, are also

true, many passages of Scripture will be the more readily understood. As for example these:—"My spirit will not remain in man forever; I will make his days an hundred and twenty years"; "Thou hast set a bound that they may not pass over"; "The number of his months is with thee"; "Man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord."

Hence man lives by the same Word by which the heavens were established, which shall not pass away unless the Word changes them. Neither shall man die, unless the same Word cuts off his life as a web that is cut while the weaver is still weaving,—as though the bounds of man's life were from morning till evening. For man's morning is the beginning of the breath of life breathed into him; his evening is the end of the web that is cut off. The weaving may be short, as when one dies in the womb; or it may be long, as was Methuselah's, or it may be of medium length as after the flood. But, whichever it be, it always depends on the Word of divine will, which is the measure of the breath of life while it remains in the body.

Therefore it is neither temperance nor a good constitution nor good health nor soundness of body that makes for long life. Nor can sickness or wounds or the violence of fire or sword shorten life without the intervention of God's decree. And there is no point to the objection that we see men murdered or scourged to death, and that most people believe that a combination of natural causes produces death. For in reality it is due solely to the will and direction of God. This alone separates body and soul, as this alone united them. God not only sustains the order of external things as he ordains, but he himself decrees and produces outward things to be the occasions, not the causes, of so important a thing as death, in order that we may believe that God claims man for himself alone.

And even as we depend altogether upon him, so let us always cling in love to him to the end, and become one spirit with him.

MAN'S DEATH IS NOT DETERMINED BY NATURE

In accordance with the above idea, man's death is not determined by nature any more than the union of body and soul is produced by nature. For however much the embryo may be intended to receive the human form, it is only potential, and subjective or material, without any power to produce the body which is to become man. In order that man may result, it is necessary that God should breathe the breath of life into the body and unite the one to the other. Hence that union depends upon God alone; and that which when united depends upon God alone cannot be separated except by God.

The Lord Jesus seems to confirm this opinion when he says, Luke XII. 15, "For a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." And he adds the parable of the rich man, whose ground brought forth plentifully and who was well and happy. But even while he was congratulating himself, rejoicing and looking forward to a long life with satisfaction, God spoke to him unexpectedly saying, "Thou fool, this night shall they require thy soul of thee." When he was thinking to himself of peace and security, sudden death overtook him. I ask: By what natural causes?

And let no one be disturbed by the plural verb, "they shall require." For the same God, who in the creation of man speaks in the plural, saying:—"Let us make man in our image, after our likeness," also says "they shall require" in undivided action, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, one God, who as he deems best dispenses life and death to man. He, and he alone, grants death and life, al-

though he administers external affairs in conformity to law and by means of distinctly congruent events,—i. e. events that are clearly in accord with each other, in order that the wisdom of faith may be contrasted with the folly of those who are deaf to reason. And on this account he cried: "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

Hence those who are wise in faith know that "man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God," i. e. as long as the word of God ordains and wills that bread shall nourish him who eats, so long does he live and no longer. If therefore anyone says that bread is an indispensable natural cause, he speaks the truth so far as God thus directs it. But inasmuch as this is not the whole truth, they believe with the greater faith who ascribe all their life and their death—whether in their mother's womb or in extreme old age or at any intervening time—to the will of God, who calls and knocks, and requires our life from us.

"Doctor's ointments are of no avail against the edicts of a judge." Now a judge is most powerful when he is likewise the legislator, intercessor and redeemer of those who are bound and accused. But the Lord Jesus is our redeemer, our intercessor, our judge, and he himself was the author of the decree that we should watch and trade until he comes. He comes however when it pleases him. Meanwhile all our time consists of trading days appointed by him,—days that shall last exactly as long as he decrees. He who died for each of us will for each of us come and knock, as he ordered, as he promised. No right to trade will be given to those who have been exiled or proscribed or sent away for a time; only to those who have been permitted to trade. And our time runs on from the beginning of the decree until he arrives. After that there will be no possibility of trading through the efficacy of any ointment or drug.

DEATH—CONTRARY TO ARISTOTLE'S IDEA—IS NOT THE MOST DREADFUL OF TERRORS

Aristotle is of the opinion that of all dreadful things death is the most terrible. Hence the commonly accepted opinion that the pain of heart rupture can not be described, because it is not to be compared with any other experience. And Brother John of Aachen has exaggerated the pain of death in a description so full and extravagant as to give the false impression that he had been restored to life, declaring that "he preferred to endure all the punishments of purgatory,—nay more the punishments of hell itself even to the last day,—rather than to die a second time." In uttering such things these thoughtless persons do not observe that sleep, epilepsy, lethargy, profound slumber, freezing, apoplexy not only are painless, but can not be felt on account of the arrest of the organ of primary sensation.

If this is so, or rather because it is so and can not on account of natural law be otherwise, in death we are conscious of little or no pain. For not only is there an arrest of the organ of primary sensation before death, but a dissolution of the general sensation of all the bodily organs precedes the separation of soul and body. So the soul of a dying man feels no pain. But if we are speaking of the suddenness of the change through which the dying man quickly passes into that unaccustomed light,—I mean, that mental, intuitive perception which the soul of every dying person receives at the very instant of dissolution,—we are wrong in calling that pain, since pain occurs not in intellectual perception, but only in physical sensation. Perhaps some suffer from grief, but not from pain.

From this it is quite clear that the statement of Aristotle means that certain persons seek a way out of their terrors through death. To these death is a refuge. But one

might say that Aristotle was not speaking of foolish persons. Then let me ask: Was Paul foolish when he desired "to depart and be with Christ"; or when he cried, "O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?" Perhaps you will say that Aristotle spoke as a pagan. But was he not a pagan when he threw himself into the raging Euripus? In thinking the taunt of his disciples more to be dreaded than death itself and therefore more terrible, did he not fear that more than death?

Hence it is clearly false that death is the most dreadful of all terrors. But to each one the loss of that which he loves is most terrible, to the miser the loss of his money, to the ambitious the loss of glory, to the cruel of power, to the wise of wisdom. Everyone is ready to purchase whatever he loves at the cost of life. It is love alone that separates the desires of the wise and the foolish. It is love alone that determines what is most terrible for each one.

TO SERVANTS OF GOD DEATH IS TRANSITION FROM EXILE AND MANY MISERIES TO THE FATHERLAND

When the Son of man shall come and knock, let the door be opened to him at once. Blessed are those servants of his who, watchful and ready, have not only kept vigil, but have desired, have expected him to come. To servants of this sort, not servants but friends, death is not death, depriving them of life. It is a change, a passing from exile into the fatherland, from darkness into light, from grief into gladness, from tears into joy, from want and beggary into splendid and secure wealth, from robbery, slavery and misery to the triumph of a most happy and long-desired kingdom.

It follows that the death of his saints is not only precious in the sight of the Lord who confers such precious gifts by means of death, but it is likewise precious in the sight

of the dying saints themselves. For confident that they will soon put off the garment of this mortality, this blindness, this darkness, this weakness, emptiness, worthlessness, misfortune,—and thirsting in blessed expectation, they will be led to the fountain of the water of life by our Lord and our God.

DEATH IS NO LONGER PUNISHMENT, BUT THE MEANS TO THE GREATEST BLESSINGS

If "precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints," how much more the death of the sanctified, when the Father has forgiven their sins! If the punishment decreed is still being inflicted, it is no longer the rod of the angered Father, but the useful medicine of a compassionate physician. Death, which was inflicted upon Adam, the transgressor, to punish his transgression, after a complete annulment of the sentence (promised in the Law itself), is no longer a punishment, but the means which will produce the greatest blessings. Moreover it is not death only that conduces to this end, but also weakness and poverty, against which we battle throughout life. For this earthly life is a warfare. And if so, then we are engaged in a conflict, in an army, under a leader, against an enemy, marching on to victory. And if all our life on earth is a warfare, then victory after life, at the end of life, nay in death itself, is the most splendid spectacle of that warfare; "for love is strong as death." Hence "precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints"; for stedfast love is victor even in death.

OUR ENTIRE LIFE PASSES, SO TO SPEAK, THROUGH SEVEN SUCCESSIVE DAYS

All the activity of our present sojourn will be comprised in the consideration of seven different things which

necessarily follow one upon another. A careful consideration of these will prove profitable:

Our life rolls on with the rotation of the years, unless it undergoes a second change and is cut off in infancy.
The succeeding years, if not interrupted in maturity, usher in old age.
Old age, with the failing of all our powers, musters disease.
Disease summons death.
Death determines our unchangeable destiny, either with those on the right hand or those on the left.
Our destiny, whatever it may be, awaits the incontestable sentence of the judgment.
This sentence of the judge will be inflexibly carried into execution and will remain unchangeable.

Now if men and youths would study their future, and if old men would study their past, they would readily discover these truths to be admonitions of wisdom ever before their eyes;—that is, if it is indeed wisdom, to think cheerfully concerning the limits of life. For the wisdom of Christians must be regarded as greater than that of the Philosophers. The latter thought it was the highest philosophy to meditate constantly upon death. But to us death is of very little consequence on account of the incomparably greater matters which await us after death. For if a man who gives necessary and useful reflection to his important concerns is wise, what greater wisdom can be conceived than giving thought to the bounds of life?

Therefore, in order that we may despise the pleasures and vanities of this present life by meditating upon the yoke of death while we live, and that we may be kindled with a desire of the future life by reflecting upon the words of the good, let us cultivate righteousness and justice.

For, in so doing, our lot, which begins to be decided before death, will—after death—be happily confirmed by the decree of the judge, that we shall be on his right hand and shall attain to eternal blessedness. The means to this end were provided through Jesus. Through him the way was made plain and the door was opened. The price too was paid by the blood of Jesus, through whose advocacy, if we truly love him, we shall enter into our possession.

EFFECTUAL MEDITATION UPON DEATH RESULTS IN GREAT GOOD

Therefore we should meditate upon death frequently and effectually. For such meditation produces great fruitage, since it is the nursery of all these blessings, which—in one way or other—are procured by the happy transmigration of the good to their fatherland. These blessings are unquestionably great, if they are precious in the sight of the Lord; and that they are precious is evident from the fact that he regards the very death of the saints as such.

Therefore why not engage in valuable reflection and frequent meditation upon death,—warning, enkindling, inciting, driving, teaching us not to cling to temporal blessings, but to push on earnestly to the goal where the blessings are sure, firm, fixed, eternal,—such blessings as the wise must seek in the midst of death? We must reflect upon that which the Spartans, the Philæni, and the early Romans despised.

REGARDING GREAT RELIANCE ON GOD IN DEATH

Assuredly all his past losses are made good to the exile upon his repentance. For him there still remains great alleviation of his ruin, and God's favor for the future. To that favor he must have recourse without delay; for it will make good all his losses, since God is very

gracious. Blessed is the man who is aided by God's favor. To him peace is proclaimed from heaven through the angel-messengers of peace.

Therefore, however short the rest of life may be, however uncertain the hour of death, however certain death, you, O Wessel, need have no dread of its terrors, the evils which precede death, the hardships and irksomeness of sickness, the distress of a mind unwilling to undergo that which must take place, the severing of friendships, the loss of what one has earnestly prayed for, and besides the evils which are to follow death, the judgment and the sentence to be executed,—and most of these are not so hard to bear as they are terrible to think of. For it is in our power to prevent and avert the greatest of these, I mean, the judgment and the sentence, inasmuch as God's favor presupposes an appeased judge and redeemer. Nay, more, it is sufficient to trust in him, to invoke his name, and in his name to ask the Father to save us, yet as if by stripes. But in order to reach the palace straightway without stripes, we must trust in God's goodness. And surely, if the troubles preceding death are great, they require only patience on the part of the invalid, relieving him from any other preparation of the soul. But if they are not great, they grant place and opportunity to prepare to meet one's God. And if we have served any great purpose here we may expect greater there. Who knows if, perchance, I shall find favor in God's sight after death? If he has so kindly spared a sinner, so graciously recalled him from his error, so abundantly assisted him when he wished to return, perhaps he will also like a father receive the returning prodigal.

THE GREAT DISADVANTAGES OF OLD AGE

Moreover, to remain here for a long time involves the fear of many troubles. In the first place, you will certainly

have to endure worn-out old age, be burdensome to your friends, and perhaps even humiliating to yourself. For who can easily enumerate the disadvantages, the mistakes, the follies of old age, especially of persons who have not grown strong in character, but have spent their days in indecent and worthless living? Finally, who knows what evils overshadow our loved ones and our fatherland? For instance, three years ago in Cologne or Nucia would any father, who dreaded the shameful captivity of his beautiful maiden daughter, have grieved if she had been taken from him by a fever?

AS IN ADAM ALL DIE, SO ALSO IN CHRIST SHALL ALL BE MADE ALIVE

Wonderful is the hand of God upon us! For at first he put the heavy yoke of death upon the transgressor and upon all his seed. Afterwards, through death he granted to his obedient Son and to all who submit to him to drink of the cup of life. "For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive." And he has ordained that a prisoner sentenced to death, a man steeped in vice and crime, should direct and lead men to life. For who may not hope for salvation, or rather may not be assured of it, when he has seen a thief, after confessing his guilt and recognizing spotless innocence, ask to be remembered, and forthwith through death pass into the kingdom?

Therefore, if we confess our guilt and Christ's innocence, and then earnestly ask him to remember us in his kingdom, unquestionably believing and confessing, we too shall enter paradise through death; not by the medium of stripes, not as if by fire; but we shall at once hear the words: "Today shalt thou be with me in paradise." It was through Jesus that death was made the door to the life of paradise. But, though Jesus opened this

way to men, still it was the thief, who, by traversing it, taught us how to obtain this favor, and became leader of the journey to all the rest of us who were involved in the same guilt and punishment. He teaches us how we may be saved,—namely by confessing our own worthlessness and our redeemer's innocence. He likewise teaches us how we may forthwith pass into the kingdom. For through penitence, confession and faith—at whatever hour—we shall enter just as did this man, who, though he had engaged in every form of robbery and ended little short of blasphemy, with but three sentences passed from punishment into the palace.

DEATH IS THE DOOR OF LIFE, AT WHICH CHRIST IS THE DOORKEEPER, BUT TO WHICH THE THIEF LEADS US

What then shall the Christian fear? The leader himself by his example begets in us complete confidence. Surely the doorkeeper, who does not exclude such a leader, will admit those whom he has redeemed with his own blood.

A PRAYER TO THE BLESSED THIEF

I pray thee, therefore, O blessed thief, by the kind hand of God upon thee, by the mercy which thou didst receive in that late hour of repentance, be thou my comrade in my last hour

THE THIEF'S THEOLOGY

What was the thief's theology? On the one hand he acknowledged his own wickedness, on the other the innocence of Christ, the sovereignty of Christ, the compassion of Christ, the deity of Christ. Perhaps he felt God's love for men. How meager a knowledge and purpose will suffice to secure salvation, if in death a man

believes, repents and trusts God! And it is even so in the case of one baptized or consecrated!

HOW GREAT HOPE MEN OF GOOD, THOUGH FEEBLE, DESIRES MAY HAVE

God is not less gracious to the sons, already born of him, when they ask a gift, than he is to the sons of wrath when they wish to return to him. Therefore when a Christian with will and intention asks for God's wisdom and love, be it indifferently or even coldly, if his will and intention so much as suffice for consecration or baptism, he will certainly obtain his request in spite of his praying in such a frame of mind. For oftentimes the disposition of the inward man is such, either from scattering thoughts or temptation or preoccupation, that he cannot readily call forth a more fervent feeling. Therefore, with great boldness, one must pray, make confession, lament his sins and praise God confidently, even if his spirit is not always stirred to its very depths. For God listens even to unimpassioned desires. Nay, belief alone is sufficient for salvation. However, trust leads to favor; and love to endearment and glory.

GREAT COMFORT FOR OUR FAINT-HEARTEDNESS

The faithful should take great comfort for their faint-heartedness from the word which was spoken to Moses, Exod. VII. 4: "I will bring forth mine army, my people, the children of Israel." This certainly is the army of God, of which it was afterwards said that "The children of Israel went up in arms," as though they had been enrolled for great and active military service. Concerning this it is thus written in Canticles I. 9: "I have compared thee, O my love, to a company of horses in Pharaoh's

chariots," and again VI. 4: "As an army with banners." Such commendation is excellent if it is matched by the activity of the soldiers, the faithful diligence of the guard, the unremitting watch of the sentinels, the vigorous courage of the men in action.

But if we investigate the conditions of the Hebrew people in this regard, all through their journey we shall find among them no camp, no military service, no guard, no fighting, in short nothing worthy of God. Even their leader Moses on eight critical occasions was afraid to assume the leadership. Aaron, appointed to be their leader's associate, was a promoter of idolatry. Miriam, their sister, on account of her murmuring was punished and excluded from the camp. The entire people, believing the spies they had sent, and disbelieving the word of God, hardened their heart, provoking God. Finally, Moses himself was not found faithful at the waters of Meribah.

Nevertheless the Lord God not only sees fit to call this people his army, but to regard them as such, not a people that will fight, but one which he protects when it is attacked, and for which he himself does battle. As Moses truly said: "Ye shall stand, and the Lord shall fight for you." Likewise the Prophet says: "Not unto us, O Lord, the glory of this victory; not unto us, but unto thy name give the glory." As though he said: "That we are crowned with safety is the result not of our fighting, but of thy grace battling for us, that thou mayst crown thy gifts in us, not our merit."

Therefore whoever, conscious of his weakness and cowardice, desires with his whole heart not to be led into temptation, whoever asks to be freed from the evil of the inward man, should rejoice even though he does not find himself contending lawfully or striving strenuously in the games. He should be free from care and rejoice, knowing that he is truly of the people of God, and although not

among the more distinguished of the people, still truly of the people, of the camp, of the army, a true soldier, so long as he does not turn back in his heart to Egypt. More than that, even if by reason of the hardship and weariness of the long, long journey he looks back toward Egypt, he does not thereby cease to be a soldier of Christ, provided he does not drive away the God who protects him or scorn the God who fights for him, regarding a desirable country as worthless and drawing back from the land that flows with milk and honey. For in that case God will be angry and will swear in his wrath that they shall not enter into rest; for not only does he who desires with all his soul to obey God's invitation, call and leading, belong to the people of God, but so does everyone who does not drive him away altogether.

Therefore if anyone listens, believes, desires, wills to be a good and faithful soldier, even this will be counted to him as military service, provided he does not yield to meanness and cowardice, since there lies the way to the hardening of the heart. And let no one be cast down or disturbed by many passages of Scripture, such as: "No one shall be crowned unless he has striven lawfully," and "For every idle word they shall render an account." These are rather the words of stern law and justice which ought to prevail,—and would, if mercy did not loosen and relax their grasp—for which all the praise is due to God, not to us. For if we were justified by our own merits, we would obtain the prize as our due, and the praise would be ours.

CONCERNING THE LORD'S WORDS IN THE GOSPEL: "BE YE PERFECT"

Lord and Master, thou didst bid us be holy, because thou art holy and perfect, even as thou, our

Father in heaven, art perfect. But "who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean," unless it be thou, who alone art pure? Didst not thou, O God, make thy creatures subject to weakness, emptiness and worthlessness, so that none might come to thee except through thyself? For no one comes to the Father except through the Son, nor can any one come to the Son unless he be drawn by the Father. Neither can any one say Jesus is Lord except in the Holy Spirit.

Why then this dread command, "Be ye perfect," when, in our inability to perform it, we are ruined if we heed it, and destroyed if we disregard it? Unless it is because he who issued the command, is just, and therefore did not intend to overwhelm our weakness and feebleness; more than that he is our Father and the Father of mercies, and in his commands he provides a hope which though hidden is sure. For when he bade us be pure, perfect, holy and worthy of God, what else does he seem to promise to the sinner who turns to him in faith but that, if he has but the desire to acquire virtue, all these blessed commands will be completely fulfilled,—if not in this life of trouble and misery, at any rate, sometime in the land of the living? For there, not the faithful servant, not the blessed Son, but the omnipotent Father in his blessed Son will secure their fulfillment; so that the faithful servant, entering into the joy of his Lord, shall esteem and love his Lord God with all his heart, with all his soul, with all his spirit, with all his strength; and shall praise, glorify and bless him, being perfect and holy in that life, a son worthy of God. Hence these are promises rather than commands.

Spiritual weakness is sin, because we are enjoined to be brave in faith and resist the lion that goeth about, roaring, seeking whom he may devour. Therefore we are commanded to be braver in battling for good than our assailant is in battling for evil. We are admonished to be victors

in all the battles in which God has willed us to engage. For it is a lifelong war to which God has appointed all who are in the flesh, and not a mere battle, which is occasional and is only for the hour. All weakness, however, such as folly, ignorance, lack of wisdom, is sin. These compel one to go defenseless into battle. Hence it is to some degree clear why we "ought always to pray and not faint," "to watch and be sober," "to withstand stedfast in our faith." But he who prays feebly, who watches feebly, who resists the lion feebly, manifestly fails to perform the command always to pray and not to faint.

All sinners therefore are weak, being but "little ones." But there is great comfort in the words, "One ought always to pray," since they imply that in spite of our constant prayers the need of cleansing still remains. For we do not pray, we cannot pray, so as to be fully answered. Therefore the Father mercifully tolerates the sordidness of our imperfection, but wishes us to pray for its removal. However, he will remove it when he pleases; but in the case of those who pray, he will not count it a sin that it has not yet been taken away.

The Farrago

II

Concerning the Causes, Mysteries and Effects of the Incarnation and Passion of Our Lord

CONCERNING THE CAUSES, MYSTERIES AND EFFECTS OF THE INCARNATION AND PASSION OF OUR LORD

Why God became Man.

WHY did God become man if not in order that the holy and visible body, the universal church of triumphant saints, might not be headless, but, on the contrary, might rejoice in its lawful head, see Eph. I. 22, "Who is head over all the church," and Col. I. 18, "He is the head of the body, the church." As regards the church triumphant, see Col. II. 10, "Who is the head of all principality."

Why did God become man? In order that the structure of the sacred temple might have a corner stone, upon which both walls, that of men and that of angels, might meet and be made firm. As regards the first, see Ps. 118, 22, "The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner." It is referred to also by the blessed Stephen in the Acts of the Apostles, who says the Jews were these builders. As regards the second, see I. Cor. III. 11, "Other foundation can no man" etc.; also I. Cor. X. 4, "And the rock was Christ."

Why did God become man? That every creature might have a mediator common alike to God and to himself,—see Gal. III. 19–20, "Till the seed should come to whom the promise hath been made; and it was ordained through angels by the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not a mediator of one; but God is one."

Why did God become man? That the entire army of

God and all the people of God might have their king,—Luke I. 33, "And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever"; Rev. XIX. 16, "And he hath on his diadem and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS."

Why did God become man? That the school of God might have its teacher,—Joel II. 23, "Be glad, then, ye daughters of Zion, and rejoice in the Lord your God, for he hath given you a teacher of righteousness."

Why did God become man? That the city of Jerusalem might have its own temple,—Rev. XXI. 22, "And I saw no temple therein; for the Lord God the Almighty, and the Lamb, are the temple thereof."

Why did God become man? That the temple of the heavenly Jerusalem might have a high priest,—Ps. 110, 4, "Thou art a priest forever." This is also mentioned in Hebrews.

Why did God become man? That all those who sacrifice in the temple of God might have their victim,—Heb. IX. 13–14, "For if the blood of goats or calves, how much more shall the blood of Christ cleanse?"

Why did God become man? That all the sheep of his pasture might have their common shepherd,—John X. 11, "I am the good shepherd." He left his ninety-nine sheep on the mountains and went away to seek the one which had strayed. Hence he had been destined and predestined to be the shepherd common to all, both the sheep that had strayed and the others, even as he had been foreseen and hated by Lucifer who pursued the Lamb.

Why did God become man? That all the sons of God and every creature might have a firstborn brother. As says Paul, "Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation."

Here follow some Learned Propositions by the Distinguished Master Wessel of Groningen concerning the Dignity of the Lamb and the Causes of the Incarnation of the Lord.

1. In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.

2. In the heaven which he had created, God forthwith created the inhabitants of heaven, the spirits.

3. These spirits, who were pure spirits, for this very reason were at once possessed of breadth of mind and depth of intellect.

4. They knew, therefore, that they did not exist before they existed.

5. They knew that they had a beginning.

6. They knew that they did not originate of themselves.

7. They knew that they were exalted creatures.

8. They knew that their creator was exalted above all and omnipotent.

9. They knew that their author was the author of their words and judgments.

10. They knew, therefore, that he was omnipotent in word and judgment.

11. They knew that they ought to be servants and were made for the service of the omnipotent God.

12. Their service was to enjoy his will by seeing, esteeming and loving him.

13. They were not all made equal in rank and in keenness of intelligence.

14. They did not all hold equally to the truth they recognized.

15. If they had all held to it, they would all have been one spirit with God.

16. If they had all been one spirit with God, they would have formed a blessed company.

17. A blessed society exists only as each individual is blessed.

18. Such a blessed society could not have been a perfect city.

19. That blessed city was destined to be a perfect kingdom.

20. If all had remained stedfast, no one of them would have been a perfect king.

21. Without a perfect king there is no perfect kingdom.

22. A perfect kingdom implies a perfect marriage.

23. The Seraphim, the Cherubim, and the Thrones were the more blessed.

24. The angels, archangels, hosts, powers, principalities and dominions were the blessed.

25. All of them, participating in this purpose, were building up a joyful and blessed city.

26. There is a certain blessedness that is abundant and rich; there is another that is perfect and final.

27. Before holding to the truth, they recognized it.

28. The recognition of the truth made them wayfarers.

29. They did not attain perfection, unless they held to God with a pure and perfect heart.

30. Perfect purity of heart does not involve the attainment of perfection.

31. Among the truths of the way, they learned that that blessed city would some time be a perfect kingdom.

32. They learned therefore that some one who was worthy would be their king.

33. Lucifer saw that this worthy king would be king over him and he was envious and gnashed with his teeth.

34. Lucifer, even if he had not envied him, could not have been the king of that kingdom himself.

35. Not one of those blessed exalted spirits was worthy to be the king of that kingdom.

36. The Cherubim and Seraphim, who were also wayfarers, saw a book sealed with seven seals.

37. They saw that some time the seals must be loosed and the books must be read by them.

38. Afterwards, having attained perfection, they saw the book still sealed and closed.

39. They knew that the sealed book was filled with great mysteries that were beyond even their blessedness to understand.

40. They knew that some time this book in response to their eager desire must be opened and seen.

41. This book was the desire of the everlasting hills, i. e. the blessed spirits.

42. This book was the desire of all nations, of the angels representing those hills.

43. No one in heaven was worthy to open this book for those blessed hills, even if they had all remained stedfast.

44. The sealed book, which was neither written within in vain nor desired in vain, was not to be opened by one who was unworthy.

45. The treasure that book contained was too rich for Cherubim and Seraphim.

46. That book was a fountain that was to ascend from the midst of paradise.

47. That book was to be opened some time to the desire of the blessed everlasting hills.

48. Therefore the prerogative of opening the book was reserved from the beginning for him who was most worthy.

49. The Lamb alone was worthy to open the book and loose the seals.

50. The Lamb alone was the book sealed, and written within and without.

51. The sealed book, written within, was the fullness

of the riches of the treasures of wisdom and glory and love of God in Christ.

52. This fullness of the treasures was reserved for no one but the Lamb.

53. God, the Word, laid hold, not on angels, nor on men, but on the Lamb.

54. All the fullness, greatness, and depth that was created of the riches of the Lamb is the likeness of God.

55. The likeness of God in the Lamb is the highest pattern to all the inhabitants of the blessed Jerusalem.

56. The pattern shown in the mountain of God's house, on the top of the mountains, is richer than all things.

57. The fullness of the riches of wisdom, glory and love in the Lamb was a copious fountain for all the trees of paradise.

58. As long as the blessed were not watered by this fountain, their blessedness was not perfect.

59. This watering was promised also to them that beheld the face of the Father.

60. This watering was not given to them apart from the glorification of the Lamb.

61. Many very great promises were made to holy men and to the blessed angels, which they did not forthwith receive.

62. That which they did not forthwith receive was deferred, God providing something better for us.

63. All the remaining riches of the kingdom cannot be compared with the riches of the Lamb.

64. The Lord has done all things in wisdom. Therefore the Most High has done all things solely on account of himself.

65. The Lord made the Lamb and the riches of the Lamb solely for his own sake.

66. He that is wise does not make a better thing for

the sake of one that is less good, although he may grant more to the lesser.

67. A wise creator always ordains the less good for the sake of the greater good.

68. Therefore the whole kingdom of the Lamb was ordained for the sake of the Lamb rather than the Lamb for the sake of the kingdom.

69. The welfare, perfection and honor of the kingdom have developed through the Lamb, but the Lamb did not come for the sake of these things as his ultimate purpose.

70. The preeminence of the Lamb was greater and more exalted than all the rest of the kingdom.

71. And if the one of the two—the kingdom or the King—had to be destroyed, God would annihilate all the rest of the creation rather than the Lamb.

72. God, the Word, assuming flesh, loved the flesh he had assumed more than the whole of the rest of creation.

73. But if he loves it more, he magnifies it more.

74. God magnified the blessedness of the Lamb more than that of all the rest of men and spirits.

75. God ordained and magnified the Lamb above all else as the first fruits of all creation.

76. He ordained that the Lamb should be a man.

77. He ordained that the Lamb should be the King of a blessed city.

78. It was fitting that the Lamb, the man, the King, should have men to dwell in his kingdom.

79. At his request, the Lamb received from the Father the promise that men should be given to him as his inheritance.

80. If neither angel nor man had fallen, the Lamb would have reigned equally blessed over them both.

81. Nevertheless it was for us, indeed, as men and for our salvation that he descended from heaven.

82. It was for our salvation, indeed, that he became a man, that he suffered, died and was buried.

83. It was neither entirely nor altogether for our salvation that he became a man.

84. It was altogether for our salvation that he suffered, died and was buried, that he became a sacrifice and a victim.

85. It was not altogether for the purpose of saving us from perdition that he became a sacrifice, a whole burnt offering, an incense.

86. Transported by the force of his love for God, that most holy soul was offered as an incense.

87. He lived in God, more for God and himself than for the purpose of saving us all.

That the Only Way to Salvation is through the Name of Jesus; and that by that Name we are made Worthy to receive the Whole Trinity.

"Neither is there any other name that is given among men wherein we must be saved." Therefore there is no other way to obtain salvation than Jesus. It is evident, then, how expedient it is for us to meditate frequently upon him, in order that we may be saved by his name. For the name of Jesus is nothing else than the knowledge of Jesus, that is begotten with godliness. And in this we must note especially that the Father sends the Comforter in the name of Jesus, as is declared in the words, "But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name." For God bestows on us so freely of himself, nay, he loves our acceptance and belief of the Incarnate Word so much, that wherever a rational mind piously accepts the Word made flesh, he will forthwith pour out his spirit upon him. And not only does God grant his spirit, but if two are gathered together in the

name of Jesus, the Son of God is in the midst of them. And he is in their midst, not because they are gathered together, but for the sake of the name of Jesus. The name of Jesus, therefore, includes the Comforter and the Son; and not only these, but since the Father also comes wherever the Son enters, the whole Trinity together makes its abode there. Hence the straightest and shortest way between us and God is sweet and pious meditation on the Lord Jesus, since indeed the Father, the Saviour, and the Comforter in a blessed company will come and make their abode with us.

Now what citizen of that blessed and holy city of Jerusalem will not look with longing and joy upon the man whom he beholds so worthily honored with the friendship of his king? Nor is it strange that the Father comes to see and visit a son, since he has given the right to become children of God to all that believe in the name of the Word made flesh, dwelling in them, full of grace, wisdom, judgment and righteousness. For "no man can say Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit." Now saying that "Jesus is Lord" is the result of the knowledge of him that is begotten in the heart. And these words come forth from the heart of him who speaks them, cleansing him of all his former polluting sordidness. For "whosoever is begotten of God, doeth no sin," since the heavenly birth keeps him from it. Now every son of God is begotten of God. Whoever believes in his name is a son of God. But everyone believes in his name who faithfully believes that the Word was made flesh, full of grace, wisdom, glory and righteousness. And through this holy seed—as it were—and faithful pledge, the same Word dwells in them that have the promise that they shall see the glory of the Incarnate Word in themselves.

Hence he that reflects upon the Word, believing that it was made flesh, may be terrified by the majesty of the

Word. Nevertheless, believing that it was made flesh—even human flesh—so that he is the Son of man, and because he is a man, therefore made under the Law so that he too received the command to love his neighbor, surely such confidence will forthwith be born in him that he will readily forget his previous terror. For if a poor man is the neighbor of a rich, powerful, humane, generous, merciful man, what assurance that fact must beget in the poor man that all his wants will be relieved. We are the neighbors of the Lord Jesus; therefore he ought to love us, he ought to love us because of the Law's command, and he truly does love us even as himself. And since he himself is full of grace, wisdom, glory and love, he loves us in all the fullness of his riches.

> With regard to Keeping in Mind the Life and Passion of our Lord; for by so Doing, our Temporal Life, being put between two Noble Lives, is ennobled and perfected.

This momentary life of ours is a thin and meager thing, like a vapor that appeareth for a little time, dry, barren, obscure and worthless, except in so far as it is ennobled by being fixed between two lives that are great, noble and admirable, as though between illustrious men. And yet it cannot be ennobled and perfected by these lives except by meditating upon, esteeming and longing for them. Our life is ennobled by partaking of these two lives, if there is:—first, a longing for the one that has been held out to us as the object of our hope, i. e. the blessed life, which is being built as a city in which we may share, for peace is in all its borders and it is filled with the finest of the wheat; and second, if there is a longing for the other life, held out to us by example, i.e. the example of our master, our king, our prophet and priest. And to whatever extent our life partakes of this second life, to that extent our life,

(passed in exile and far from our home, nay in death itself), —to that extent, I say, is our life quickened and to that extent is it made blessed in that city. For nothing is as effective in turning men's minds toward goodness as to be devoutly occupied with the life and passion of our Lord. For this keeps him ever before them, as one born for them, and given to them, as one sent, commanded, delivered over, forsaken, abandoned, trampled upon, bruised for their sakes, one in whom dwells bodily all the fullness of divine virtue, divine knowledge, and divine richness. If we seek him devoutly, what may we not hope from God, who warns, teaches and urges us to seek him, and rejoices more in giving him to us than in receiving us to himself?

And even as nothing is more effective and more fruitful for us, so we can do nothing more acceptable or pleasing to God. For even the Cherubim and Seraphim render this to the Lord, as the Prophet says, "for all his benefits toward us." Not alone, therefore, for forgiveness, but for grace and for glory; inasmuch as, for all the benefits that God has rendered to us, we can render this thing alone to him in order to receive the cup of salvation. Finally, the life of our Lord Jesus Christ is for us the ark of the covenant, it is Jacob's ladder from heaven to earth, it is the lamb of the passover, the pillar of cloud and fire, the manna, the pattern of the holy building that was showed in the mount, and the brazen serpent set upon a standard amid the biting of the fiery serpents. He that looks upon this serpent, no matter how poisonous the serpent by which he has been bitten may be, is forthwith found to be unharmed, and will live. Situated as our life is amid fiery serpents and scorpions, if we frequently and thoughtfully meditate upon that brazen serpent, if meditating thus we discern and esteem it, if meditating upon and esteeming it, we love it, we shall sleep secure among the fiery hissings. For the life of Jesus, great and holy before God, is be-

stowed upon us in so far as we cling to him by reflecting upon, esteeming and loving him. And there is no other way to that promised land except under the guidance of that pillar of cloud and fire through the desolate and pathless wilderness, for He alone is "the way, and the truth and the life." I say not only our present life here, as we believe and are made righteous in him (since he bestows his own life upon them that believe on him), but also the life that is promised to those who shall attain to it through the blessed operation of his hierarchic sovereignty and priesthood. But the latter life is in the Word itself through the blessed vision, so that he who was the beginning may be himself the end of it.

"I am the Way, and the Truth, and the Life."
John XIV. 6.

Let us carefully note that the Lord Jesus said "I." Who is that "I"? Assuredly, "I, the eternal, essential Word, existing of myself, the first life of the first Word living in myself, made flesh for your sakes." Now, just as the Word is the source (*exitus*) of existence for all created things, so also he is the means (*transitus*) of blessed knowledge for all the saints, so that—in having seen God seeing, ordering, willing all things—they know all things far more blessedly than if they intuitively saw them in themselves. Nevertheless, since you have fallen far short of this knowledge in the Word, and therefore fallen far short of life, no return (*reditus*) is open to this exalted life except through flesh that is exalted above all the rest of the creation. And no access (*aditus*) is given to this exalted flesh except through flesh that has been sanctified. Moreover there is no access to such flesh except by being humiliated, trampled upon, forsaken, abandoned, cursed. For "no one hath ascended into heaven, but he that de-

scended out of heaven; even the Son of man, who is in heaven." "Now this, He ascended, what is it but that he first descended into the lower parts of the earth?" Hence he that descended is also he that ascended. And in that he was made a curse for all, was abandoned and forsaken by the people, was trampled on by men and humiliated by God and smitten for us,—through him thus smitten, humiliated, trampled upon, forsaken, abandoned and made a curse for us, a return (*regressus*) to that holy flesh was made and opened to us. Behold how truly he is the way, leading through the truth of holiness to the blessed life! And, further, behold how he is the truth, in true affliction, true holiness, true happiness! Further, how he is the life, undefiled in suffering, the life precious in holiness! But there is no need of our being reminded that he is the life in happiness, which is the end and fruit of life.

> How we ought constantly to look upon Christ, who was crucified for us and lifted up from the Earth, in order that thus he might draw us to himself and Man might come "to the Exalted Heart."
>
> Ps. 64, 6.

1. "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto myself," John XII. 32.

2. Moses lifted up the serpent; the Jews lifted up the Son of man.

3. "Also God highly exalted him and gave unto him the name above every name."

4. He has also been exalted by man, coming to "the exalted heart" with which God is exalted.

5. A truly exalted heart is one in which there is naught but this exalted thought concerning God: namely, that he (Christ) was the sign set up on the mountain, which is spoken against by many.

6. All who are not prepared with lofty purpose to love him alone, or at least more than all else, have fallen before that sign and remain at its foot.

7. Our eyes must not turn away from that sign, because our hearts should always ardently desire it, in order that where our treasure is, there our heart may be also; and where our love is, there our eyes may be also.

8. Surely our treasure is exalted above all things; but as long as we do not love him above all, his name is not exalted in us above all.

9. For his name in us is brought low in proportion as we love something more than him, equally with him, or even less than him,—and not for his sake.

10. And so long as his name alone is not thus truly, wholly and sincerely exalted, so long the house of God upon which his name is invoked is polluted.

11. And his name is so little hallowed in God's house that sacrifice is offered to Baal with dogs and swine, and the house of our holiness is turned into a brothel or into the wallowing of abomination.

12. For all things in the temple—as being a place of prayer to God—should be not profane, not superstitious, not of corrupt religion,—but sacred, in keeping with the name of God.

13. And hence the incense in Solomon's temple, and likewise the oxen and rams, sheep and doves, were there solely for the reason that they were intended to be sacrificed and offered to God, being used as a sacrifice or a victim, as first fruits, sacrifices, or burnt offerings.

14. Therefore the stable and the market place were distinct from the temple of God in their purpose.

15. And whoever did not treat the things there in accordance with this purpose, was profane and superstitious and corrupt in religion.

16. Hence all who sell these things are cast out of

God's house in most righteous severity by one who is filled with zeal for the house of God.

17. Moreover all sell these things, who commit sacrilege by offering sacrifices to God, (as though they bestowed something of their own upon him), with any other purpose than that of simply seeking God.

18. Whoever, therefore, in any place of the Lord's dominion, by any act of his, at any time, either apart by himself, or in company with his brothers, with any purpose of pleasure or vanity, treats what ought to be to the honor of God as though it were his own, and sells it in shameful sacrilege, is driven out of God's temple by the whip of God with irresistible severity. For whatever does not give glory to God in his temple is not permitted to remain in it.

19. But those who make carnal pleasure their object are cast into streams of brimstone and pitch. And those who make vanity their object will be overtaken by stormy winds and flashing thunderbolts. For the flesh dies and vanishes away like water. This world also swiftly vanishes away like a vapor that appeareth for a little time.

20. If, however, a man comes to the exalted heart, God will be exalted in his heart.

21. Therefore it is with the exalted heart that man comes to the exalted God, and there is no access to the exalted God but by the exalted heart.

22. Hence Magdalene was forbidden to touch the Lord, because the Word made flesh had not been exalted yet in her heart. For although she hung upon him with her whole heart so that she was wholly prepared and ready to believe whatever he commanded, nevertheless—with regard to the divinity of the Incarnate Word—she had not yet so perfectly come to the exalted heart that God the Word was truly exalted in her heart on equal terms with the Father. Therefore she could not yet kiss him with

the worthy, inward kiss, but only with a kiss that was not pure. When, however, she had been thoroughly instructed within and confessed the truth of the consubstantial deity, mouth to mouth she received the pure, inward kiss; because, then, Jesus having been lifted up, drew her and all men to himself, having first descended to her. But in one's approach to God there is a beginning, the Gospel; then, a conferring together; afterwards, intercourse. And after these longing, discipline; then counsel, cure, employment; then command, leadership, office. After these, judgment, the whip, zeal; then the feast, the kiss, marriage.

Propositions concerning the Lamb's Battle with the Dragon; and concerning the Greatness and Bitterness of the Passion of our Lord.

1. A lamb is the gentlest of all living beings.
2. A huge dragon is the fiercest, the most malicious of all living beings.
3. When a lamb is compelled to fight with a dragon, it is only from the most stern necessity.
4. It was the Father's command that compelled the Lamb to battle with the enormous dragon.
5. To all who love the Lamb as the bride, this battle with the dragon is a most grievous spectacle.
6. It is not possible for men to view this battle in clear light, but only, as it were, in lamp-light.
7. Whether the light of the rising day-star will clearly reveal the greatness of the battle, I should not dare to decide.
8. It is certain that in the light of approaching day, in the light of reddening dawn, it will be the most clear spectacle and the most bitter sight.
9. The Lamb and the dragon are the worst and most deadly of enemies among all creatures.

10. The dragon hated God above all things with the fiercest zeal and hatred.

11. After God, the dragon hated nothing as much as the Lamb.

12. No such love toward God was ever begotten as the firstborn love of the Lamb.

13. The Lamb's love for God was greater than that of every other holy, blessed creature. God, the Father, commanded the Lamb to battle with the dragon for the sake of God's glory.

14. In this command God, the entire Trinity, required the Lamb to fight the dragon solely with the principles, characteristics and weapons of a lamb.

15. The characteristics of a lamb are to tremble, to fear, to dread, to be sorrowful, to be distressed, to be left desolate, to submit to the slaughterer even to death.

16. The principles and weapons of a lamb are obedience, patience, humility, love, gentleness, readiness and promptness.

17. The weapons of a dragon are cruelty, wickedness, fierceness, malice, and the greatest natural strength, unless he be held in check.

18. Great is the Lamb, who is likewise the ruler, the Lord.

19. The ruler, the Lord, the Lord even of the dragon, undertook to wage a battle with the principles and weapons of a lamb.

20. In that battle the Lamb fought to the utmost with the dragon.

21. Hence in that battle the dragon put forth to his utmost all his wickedness and malice, with all his natural power.

22. Although the dragon was most wicked and malicious and rushed upon the Lamb with the entire strength of his nature, yet God cooperated with him in everything.

23. No one can do anything without God's cooperation.

24. God, cooperating with the dragon, smote the Lamb.

25. And for this reason he is said by Esaias to have been smitten of God.

26. Thus the Lamb was smitten and humiliated not so much by the dragon, as by God.

27. In that battle God forsook the Lamb to the end, and the Lamb emptied and denied himself to the very end.

28. God forsook the Lamb in that battle that he might suffer to the end. It was not that he might be conquered that he forsook him.

29. The Lamb was put under a law by suffering to conquer—and that utterly—the ferocity of the dragon.

30. In that battle, waged solely with the principles and weapons of the Lamb, the most ferocious dragon was completely conquered.

31. If in his fight the dragon was utterly and completely conquered by the Lamb, then he raged altogether furiously against the Lamb.

32. And if he raged furiously against the Lamb, then he was absolutely free and untrammeled in his battle with the Lamb.

33. No one can understand the greatness of that battle, if he does not know the wickedness and malice of the dragon thus let loose.

34. The hour of that battle was the power of darkness.

35. If the dragon fought with absolute freedom, then he was unhindered, powerful and mighty in all the resources of his nature.

36. By his natural power and rank, every spirit can induce all manner of suffering in a soul, when his power is given free course.

37. God so loved the world that he gave to it his only begotten Son as a testator bound by an oath.

38. It behooved the only begotten Son of God, a

testator under oath, to become the angel of the testament and the minister of the new testament, laying hold, not on angels, but on the seed of Abraham.

39. A testament is of no avail as long as the testator is not dead.

40. God so loved the world that he made his only begotten Son—the firstborn of the whole creation—the seed of Abraham.

41. God so loved the world that he spared not the Lamb, the ruler, the firstborn of all the sons of God.

42. God so loved the world that he laid upon the Lamb the obligation and necessity of a hard battle.

43. God so loved the world that he bound his Son, the Lord, to do battle as a lamb. The firstborn of the whole creation, i. e. the Word made flesh, so loved the Father that he undertook to battle with the released dragon with all the limitations of a lamb, and he thus engaged in battle with the dragon saying: "That the world may know that I love the Father, and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do."

44. And so the most ferocious dragon excited the most violent suffering in the soul of the Lamb.

45. He excited in the soul of the Lamb every kind of sharp grief, fear, loathing, mourning, sadness, agony, confusion, desolation, faint-heartedness, wrath, indignation and bitterness.

46. For being let loose without restraint he employed all the powers of his nature in their full strength upon the flesh of the Lamb.

47. He was able in one moment to show him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, in order to entice him.

48. And when he met him, what must we believe he poured out upon him, forsaken and consigned to oblivion as he was, in order to cast him down and devour him!

49. And the Lamb contended not only with the dragon, but at the same time with all the hosts of darkness that hated God and the Lamb; so that together with the dragon all his angels simultaneously attacked the Lamb.

50. In that struggle the dragon was so conquered, together with all the hosts of the powers of darkness, that he himself knew he was obviously vanquished.

51. If the dragon did not judge for himself and know that he had been conquered, the mouth of them that speak lies would not have been completely stopped.

52. And since the mouth of them that speak lies was completely stopped, it followed that not only was the dragon utterly vanquished by the principles, characteristics and weapons of the Lamb, but so also were all his angels, to whom in the battle the gentle Lamb was exposed in every part of his mind, intelligence and will.

53. And against all their madness, wickedness and malice the Lamb fought with the blameless principles of a lamb.

54. Hence, it is now perfectly clear how the Lamb was tempted in all points like as we, his brothers, are through all the assaults of the bad angels, yet without sin.

55. Sufferings and assaults, however great, of whatever sort, through bad angels, are not sins—unless the will give consent—but rather the means of virtue and victory.

56. To mortal man, the magnitude and multitude of his sufferings are incomprehensible. In all this suffering the Lamb's heart was strengthened so that it could not be moved.

57. The Lamb was victorious, the Lamb set up his trophies, so that every knee of things under the earth should bow to him forever; and he is forever triumphant, trampling upon the necks of the proud; and they in the light of the truth are forced to admit that they have been vanquished by the Lamb.

58. And the angels sing the triumph of the Lamb, saying, "The Lord strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle, and the King of glory shall come in."

59. And the dragon knows with absolute certainty that he has been conquered in all points. On account of his fear and hatred the certainty of this victory is to the dragon like fire in his eyes.

60. Hence the second misery for the dragon is the clear evidence of this victory.

61. Whether he will or not, the dragon, together with every knee of things under the earth, is bowed in the name of Jesus because of the clear evidence of this victory in the lower world.

There is no greater misery than to be forever seeing most clearly what one does not wish to see.

62. The greatest and first misery for the dragon is to know of a certainty that God is forever blessed in himself.

63. And so his second misery is to see, even in himself and in all things, that God has given to the victorious Lamb a name above every name.

64. His third misery is that the dragon himself, together with all the hosts of darkness, fashioned this crown for the Lamb.

65. From the first instant of his conception in his mother's womb, the Lamb knew that this mighty battle was put upon his shoulders.

66. Because of this bitter cup, he had of necessity so bitter a baptism to be baptized with.

67. In a manner incomprehensible to us, the Lamb was straitened throughout his whole life. The measure of his straitening and anguish was suggested by him to some degree when he said: "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!"

68. He indicates it somewhat more clearly when he

began to be greatly amazed and sore troubled in the garden.

69. But he expressed it more clearly when he said that his soul was exceeding sorrowful even unto death.

70. And more still when in his agony he sweat blood, for such agony never straitened any other man.

71. Still more, when he said, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

72. But most of all, when he said most fully, "No one shall take my life away from me."

73. For no power of darkness, however let loose, could so overcome the Lamb as to slay him.

74. He himself, who had the power to lay down his life, would not lay it down without completing the supreme peace offering and burnt sacrifice of the high priest.

75. There is no resemblance to this in the warfare and sacrifice of the rest of the saints; for they were not so utterly forsaken by God.

76. Nor did the rest of the saints have such breadth of mind; for they did not have the intuitive knowledge of all things, as did the Lamb.

77. The Spirit was given to Christ without measure.

78. In accordance with the measure and fullness of the Spirit given to Christ by the Father, he received the command to fulfil a worthy priesthood and to sacrifice with all the completeness of legal sacrifices.

79. The highest priest must have been clothed with the highest fortitude before he was clothed with the highest honor.

80. In all respects, therefore, Christ's offering was an odor of the sweetest smell.

81. This most sweet odor was recognition, esteem and acceptance in the eyes of God and the admiration of all the saints and the blessed.

82. The priesthood of the Thrones, of the Cherubim and the Seraphim, and of the Virgin Mother was made more holy and perfect through the priesthood of Christ.

83. Therefore their incense was made far more sweet smelling and was perfected by the incense of Christ. It pleased God to renew all things that are in heaven and in earth through the cross, i. e. through the priesthood and sacrifice (of Christ).

84. That Christ might enter into his perfect glory, the glory of his perfect triumph, he battled with perfect fortitude.

85. That Christ might completely reconcile the exiles that had been cast out in anger, it was necessary that he should completely appease divine justice.

86. Not only was the bitterness of the myrrh in that incense so great that it stopped the mouths of them that spake lies, but the myrrh of that incense filled and overflowed the mouths of the blessed angels chanting their praises forever.

87. The myrrh of that incense fully distinguished the supreme King, fully clothed and adorned the supreme priest, and rendered the incense worthy of its office.

88. That incense satisfied the law, pacified justice, and appeased the most just and severe lawgiver, in that it wholly restored and satisfied the law.

89. Job says: "Oh that my sins, for which I have deserved wrath, and the calamities which I suffer were weighed in the balances; for they would be heavier than the sand of the sea." These words, taken strictly and exactly, can apply to no one but the Lord Jesus Christ on the cross.

90. For although the Lord Jesus did not sin, yet, since he gave himself to be a surety and pledge for sinners, their sins became his own.

91. Christ became the price and pledge of our redemption by the command of the Father.

92. Christ was made our sin, our anathema, and even our curse, when he was hung upon the cross as though laid in the balances.

93. Therefore he suffered a heavier calamity than the sins of all men deserved.

94. Nor was he content to make the calamity equal to our sins, but with measure pressed down, shaken together, running over and superabundant to render satisfaction for the sin of the world.

95. So that, when our transgression superabounded, the grace of God, who tasted of death, might superabound, being far heavier than the sand of the sea.

96. Zechariah points out that he suffered not only in the flesh from without, or in the five outward senses.

97. He points out that Jesus, the high priest, standing at the altar, clothed with filthy garments, suffered not merely in the more inward organic powers.

98. Zechariah saw Satan standing at Jesus' right hand to be his adversary, and therefore not simply in his animal passions.

99. The right hand was the right hand of the holiness of the Lamb, as a wayfarer, not the right hand of him who attained the blessed fruition.

100. For manifestly a certain part on the right of the Lamb remained to be filled with joy and gladness in the countenance of God.

101. Satan was standing opposite his right hand.

102. Even as this right hand was greater than the right hand of Michael who fought with the dragon, so much the more serious was the dragon's battle with the Lamb than with Michael, and so much the more did he battle with the Lamb than with Michael.

103. In the battle with Michael the dragon drew the third part of the stars.

104. In the dragon's battle with Michael the fighting went on with neither animal nor organic passions.

105. This struggle of the Lamb resulted in the wounds and blood of the Lamb.

106. The command is issued that the Lamb's blood be sprinkled in the form of the cross upon the two side posts and upon the lintel.

107. The house, where the blood was sprinkled in accordance with the Law, is saved from the destroyer.

108. Whoever washes his robes in the blood of the Lamb is delivered from the bondage of corruption.

109. They that look upon the brazen serpent that was lifted up are cured of all the deadly poison of the fiery serpents.

110. They that have eyes to see look upon the exemplar that was lifted up from the earth.

111. They that look upon the exemplar that was lifted up from the earth lift their eyes of their own accord from the earth to it.

112. They that look upon the exemplar receive and embrace him as the highest example of guidance, redemption and direction.

113. Those who take him for guidance cling to him; those who take him for direction imitate him; those who take him for redemption esteem and love him.

114. Whoever clings to him so that he follows and imitates him is already washing his robes in the blood of the Lamb.

115. If a person who washes his robes in the blood of the Lamb looks backward he is not yet a worthy spectator of such an exemplar.

116. He that washes his robes worthily in the blood of the Lamb makes them whiter than snow.

117. The robe that is washed in the blood of the Lamb and made whiter than snow is the only wedding garment.

118. At the wedding of the Lamb there is no wedding garment but the love of the Lamb.

119. He that does not love the Lamb worthily does not wash his robes worthily in the blood of the Lamb.

120. According to the Apostle, he that does not love the Lord Jesus is anathema.

121. Not every kind of love of the Lamb is love.

122. He only is considered to love the Lamb who so loves the Lamb that has suffered for him that the Lamb's wounds are bitterer to him than his own.

123. It does not suffice for purity of love for the Lamb that the Lamb's wounds should be bitterer to one who loves him than his own.

124. As long and as much as one considers his own wounds to be less bitter than the Lamb's, so long and so much does he still love himself.

125. Each one can readily decide for himself whether or not he loves the Lamb sincerely.

126. In order that one's love for the Lamb may be pure and sincere it must meet this test, viz. that to him nothing is harsh or bitter but the pains and anguish of the Lamb.

127. Sincere love of the Lamb, if it is not pure, is not yet worthy of the Lamb's love.

128. Only pure and perfect love of the Lamb perfectly and purely crucifies the lover of the Lamb.

129. To one who loves the Lamb perfectly, the Lamb's cross becomes his own.

130. Love of self and all sin are bitterer to the Lamb than the cross. For the Lamb embraced the cross for the purpose of washing sin away.

131. Only perfect love of the Lamb makes men lamb-

like,—with the perfect principles, characteristics and weapons of a Lamb.

132. To all who are wholly like the Lamb the lusts of the flesh are bitterer than the cross.

133. To those who love the Lamb wholly, the world and all the lust thereof are a cross. He that loves him perfectly, recognizing the kingdom of the Lamb, reigns in it more than in his own.

134. Nay, he reigns only in the kingdom of the Lamb, not in his own, if he loves not himself but the Lamb perfectly, even as he is tortured and crucified only in the cross of the Lamb.

135. The love of the Lamb is the only fire which the Lord came to send into the earth, desiring that it be kindled.

136. This is the only fire which, when perfectly kindled, burns up the wood, hay and stubble completely.

137. Whatever is burned up by that fire is harmful.

138. Love for the crucified Lamb, when it is perfect, is the perfect key of the kingdom.

139. Love for the Lamb as a ruler, when it is pure and perfect, is not so much the key of the kingdom of heaven as it is the throne and seat of the kingdom.

140. That fire of perfect love for the Lamb, burning up self-love root and branch, makes complete sacrifice of self to the Lamb and to God.

141. To such love as this the Apostle betroths us all as chaste maidens not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing.

142. And so long as men do not have this perfect love of the Lamb they are not yet chaste maidens.

143. This the Apostle's betrothal is made in view of a future wedding.

144. The betrothal, as regards the present, will not be consummated except to those who love worthily, purely, perfectly and holily.

145. The betrothal, as regards the future, even the promise of salvation, involves the anathema connected with the present wedding.

146. He that does not love the Lord Jesus purely is anathema from the point of view of that wedding.

147. No one can love the Lamb perfectly who does not know the Lamb perfectly.

148. No one can know the greatness of the battles of the Lamb unless he knows perfectly the two foundations of the two cities, of which the blessed Augustine discourses in the last chapter of the IVth book of "*De Civitate Dei.*"

149. No one worthily estimates the greatness of that battle unless he worthily estimates the passionate zeal of the two contestants.

150. The Lamb's zeal for God and for the house of God was as great as his love for God, as great as the hatred with which he hated iniquity.

151. The dragon's zeal was as great as his love for himself and as great as his hatred for God and the Lamb.

152. These two most fervent zeals battled together in a most hard fought battle.

153. The zeal of the dragon was most furious against God and the Lamb.

154. The zeal of the Lamb was most ardent for the glory of God and for the house of God.

155. Hence the battle of the Lamb with the dragon was as fierce as could be aroused by the most glowing zeal of the two contestants.

Other Propositions of Master Wessel concerning the Mystery of the Cross and the Way of the Tree of Life; concerning the Flaming, Turning Sword; concerning the Mystery of the Four Dimensions of the Cross.

1. Together with all the saints we ought to understand what length, breadth, height and depth are. For those whose God is holy, ought themselves to be holy.

2. Length and breadth constitute the dimensions of the cross.

3. A man standing with extended arms presents the form of a cross.

4. Length is from head to feet; breadth from right to left. The head represents the height; the feet, the depth in a man.

5. The form of a man is the figure of a cross; a sword has the figure of a cross.

6. A flaming sword, which turns every way, guards the way of the tree of life.

7. There could be no approach to the tree of life but by the flaming, turning sword.

8. Since the flaming, smiting sword turns every way, there is no approach but by death.

9. The two-edged, turning sword cleaves, cuts down and slays on all sides those that are unworthy of the tree of life, lest its fruit be eaten by the unworthy. The flaming, turning sword burns and devours everywhere.

10. The cross did not suffice to guard the way to the tree of life properly.

11. For a man, eager for life, could either steal secretly or climb over.

12. The way to the tree of life is guarded by the sword; hence there is no approach to the tree of life except through wounds and blood and death.

13. The cross and the two-edged sword do not guard the tree of life securely enough except as the two-edged sword is wielded with the force of the tempest.

14. The blow of the two-edged, turning sword not only wounds and slays, but it cuts into pieces the heart of anyone that approaches. For it cuts stroke after stroke.

15. This cutting to pieces and the contrition of the heart are the same.

16. The tree of life is of such value that it is not properly guarded either by the cross or by the sword, even if it is two-edged and turns every way, unless all these are absolutely flaming.

17. To reach the tree of life it is not enough to bleed because of wounds, it is not enough to die, it is not enough to be bruised and ground into pieces; but it is necessary to be consumed by the devouring fire.

18. Truly he that wishes life must be no coward.

19. The way of the tree of life leads, not along slopes, not along declivities, but upon steep heights.

20. The tree of life permits no coward to possess it.

21. The tree of life is sought by no idle trader.

22. The way to the tree of life is open to no sluggish lover.

23. A sluggish man without fire cannot dwell with the devouring fire.

24. Love of the tree of life is a form of the most strenuous military service,—away, ye sluggards!

25. The tree of life being tasted gives life to the world.

26. Life is not given but by the tree of life.

27. The tree of life is not reached but by the way of the tree of life.

28. The fruit of the tree of life is life eternal.

29. The fruit of the tree of life is the kingdom of heaven. The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence.

30. The violent seize the way, the tree, the fruit, the life, heaven, and the kingdom of heaven.

31. The way of the tree of life leads to life by means of the two-edged, keen, turning, flaming sword.

32. The way of life is through consuming death.

33. The way of the tree of life is not so much by means of the sword as it is the sword itself.

34. The two-edged, turning, flaming sword is the same as the cross of Christ.

35. It is not to be supposed that the cross or the sword is corporeal, or that the way extends locally, or that the tree of life is material or corporeal.

36. Just as eternal life is purely spiritual, so the tree of life, the way to the tree of life, the sword, and the cross itself are to be understood as spiritual.

37. For this is life eternal, to know the true God and him whom God sent, even Jesus Christ.

38. Jesus Christ is the tree of life.

39. Jesus is life eternal, Jesus is the way to life.

40. No one comes to Jesus but through Jesus.

41. No one comes to Jesus but in accordance with Jesus.

42. Jesus is the cross and the sword, guarding, protecting, defending the way to the tree of life.

43. The stern guard of the way admits no one that is cowardly, indifferent, cold or lazy. Everyone is excluded who does not comprehend height, depth, right and left.

44. The top of the cross is the highest and promptest obedience.

45. The right arm of the cross toward the south is the most ardent love toward God.

46. The left arm of the cross toward the north is the most arduous patience.

47. The bottom of the cross is the deepest humility.

48. This tree was sent in the bread which glories in having God as his Father.

49. This sword pierced the soul of the Virgin Mother.

50. This was Paul's glory, without which he had nothing to glory in.

51. This is the Christian's cross, on which those who are Christ's have crucified their flesh, their lusts and their passions.

52. This is that height and depth, length and breadth which must be comprehended by all the saints.

53. This is the debt of slaves, the hearers of the Law.

54. As long as the husbandman does not pay this debt fully he remains always a debtor.

55. According to the teaching of the great Teacher, until we pay this debt which has not been paid, we are always compelled to pray that it may be forgiven us.

56. While the cross is the debt of weak Christians, it is the banner of Christian warriors, the renowned triumph of the glorious victors, the standard of those that conquer.

57. This debt binds all Christians.

58. No one is released from the bond of this debt but he who pays it.

59. Each one is released in so much as he pays it.

60. God releases none from the bond of this debt but those who pay it.

61. The mediator between God and men, the Lamb of God, does not take away the sins of the world except as one takes up his cross and follows him.

62. The Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world is the ensign that is lifted up on the mountain to be seen of all nations.

63. The ensign lifted up on the mountain is the pattern of the spiritual structure shown on the mountain.

64. A pattern apart from imitation is useless, just as a shoe is useless if there is nothing to cover with it.

65. The pattern that was lifted up from the earth and shown on the mountain has drawn all men to himself.

66. There is no one who is not drawn by this pattern.

67. This pattern makes a feast on the mountain for all that have been drawn to it.

68. This is a most rich feast of things full of marrow, a feast of men drunken with wine, of men drunken with the love of wines on the lees.

69. No one feasts who does not live.

70. No one lives but he that loves worthily.

71. Unworthy love is madness. This is a feast of those who truly feast.

72. This feast is a symposium.

73. A symposium is a symbol and a drinking together.

74. This symbol and symposium is drunk in the cup of the covenant.

75. The cup of the covenant is the cup of salvation.

76. Apart from the cup of salvation there is no salvation. Apart from salvation there is no life.

77. There is no testament without the death of the testator.

78. There is no cup of salvation apart from the cup of the testament.

79. Therefore there is no salvation and life apart from the death of the testator.

80. He that does not love the testator does not feast with the testator.

81. If the testator is not lifted up from the earth, he does not establish a covenant.

82. The testator that has been lifted up from the earth is himself the covenant.

83. The testator that has been lifted up from the earth draws all men to himself through the desire for his covenant. He that desires life and salvation is already drawn to the testator that has been lifted up from the earth. Each one is drawn just so far as he wishes life and salvation.

How the Burnt Offering of Christ, our High Priest, becomes our Own.

1. We ought to be perfectly righteous, inasmuch as we are bidden to anticipate the glory of the perfectly righteous.

2. But the perfect righteousness and holiness that is due from us has been offered and paid by the high priest.

3. And whoever believes in the name of that high priest, whether Jew or Gentile, makes the offering of the priest his own.

4. As often as we, with the piety of the high priest, renew his offering, we are justified through it.

5. All power in heaven and in earth has been given to him, wherever he may be, who wishes to be his minister.

6. But every son of God ministers to him as to the firstborn.

7. As many as accept him, i.e. as many as believe in his name, receive power to become the sons of God.

8. In every partaking of a sacrament, if we partake worthily, we make the burnt offering of the high priest our own.

9. In every commemoration of Jesus, we offer that highest incense of perfected holiness; for he that doth not eat hath not life in himself.

10. And he that believeth hath eternal life; therefore he eateth and eateth worthily; however, nothing of our own can be justly compared in worthiness with such great offerings.

That Faith is not the Cause of our Justification, but its Proof.

"Already ye are clean because of the word which I have spoken unto you." Not because of your faith or because of the word of your confession, even though ye are clean, having the word of faith in your heart and the word of confession in your mouth, since it is he that cleanseth the hearts of the faithful by faith; but not because of faith, but because of the speech and word of God, which quickeneth a man. And likewise in baptism, it is not because of the word of belief and confession, nor because of the word of the sacrament of baptism, but because of the word of God who speaks, that a wicked man is justified,

is quickened, living in faith and because of faith. I say, by faith as a proof, but not as a cause. For all these things are done through the word, concerning which it was said, "Already ye are clean because of the word which I have spoken unto you,"—as he shows in his discourse.

The Apostle, in Hebrews III, 14, calls faith and confession the beginning of our confidence in Christ, because by it we become partakers in Christ, since he is the life. "The just shall live by faith." And this he states more explicitly at the end of the third chapter, where he says, "To whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest." Hence in unbelievers, their unbelief separates them from life. But he that believeth on him hath eternal life. Therefore our good works nourish and strengthen our faith, but do not make it alive, yet they strengthen the bond of life, viz. our faith. For only Christ and the Spirit quicken us, and Christ's sacrifice sanctifies us, and we are more strongly bound to this life by the stronger bond of our faith. But nothing strengthens this bond more than love; for love is strong as death. When indeed faith works through love, it is firm and the beginning of our confidence is firm. Therefore the beginning of their confidence in Christ is most firm in those in whom love alone works, etc. But in other works, too, that are undertaken because of love, the bond of life is also firm. For there is no approach to God except through Christ. And just as a weak man, even though he is drawing near to death—and drawing nearer as his weakness increases,—so long as he performs any function of life, is said to live and does live, though but feebly; so also in the spirit, whoever believes in Christ, even so feebly that he does not act against Christ,—though he is weak, he lives; and if he be taken hence thus believing, he will be saved. For we must not take lightly the word of the Lord Jesus to John, "Forbid him not; for he that is not against you is for you." Just

as we read that the sons and children of unbelievers, who started out with them from Egypt, were not prevented from entering into the promised inheritance because of their unbelief. And certain persons are introduced to this beginning of confidence from their mother's womb, as Jeremiah and John the Baptist; some through the washing of regeneration, others without it. Some are recalled to life almost at the very gates, when they are just about to breathe out their life. Others are recalled from the midst of sin, as Matthew, Magdalene, etc.

Propositions concerning the Grace of God and Faith in Jesus Christ, taken from the Apostle Paul.

1. Who died for our sins and was raised for our justification.

2. Christ was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead, even Christ our Lord.

3. Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

4. By the works of the law shall no flesh be justified before him; even if one fulfil the chief commandment by his work, he will not because of this be righteous in God's sight.

5. But all the sufficiency of our righteousness is from God through the Word incarnate, full of grace and truth in the Holy Spirit, through Christ our priest.

6. For through the law cometh the knowledge of sin.

7. But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets.

8. Even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe.

9. All have sinned and fall short of the glory of God;

being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in his blood, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the showing, I say, of his righteousness at this present season; that he might himself be just and the justifier of him that hath faith.

10. Therefore by a law of faith, all glorying on the part of him that doeth and worketh is excluded.

11. If Abraham was justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not toward God.

12. But Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness.

13. He believed on him, who justifieth the ungodly man that believeth on him.

14. This righteousness by faith Abraham had, even in uncircumcision.

15. The seal of this righteousness is circumcision. Hence with respect to both, it is faith that justifieth, not circumcision, not a law. But faith first justifieth in the case of both. Not because of the merit of him that believeth, but because of the purpose and acceptance of God, in whom he believed. For a father of many nations have I made thee before God in whom thou hast believed, who calleth the things that are not, as though they were.

16. Romans v. Through the Lord Jesus we have access by faith into this grace, i. e. of justification, and in this grace we stand, and we rejoice in hope of the glory of the sons of God.

17. Hence it is not our faith—whether it be in Christ or in God who delivereth Christ over to be a sacrifice—nor is it the sacrifice of Christ that constitutes our righteousness; but it is the purpose of God, who accepteth the sacrifice of Christ, and who through Christ accepteth the sacrifice of Christians.

18. God commendeth his own love toward us, etc. Being justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him.

19. Hence in his blood there is not only forgiveness of sins, but both justification and salvation. While we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son. Hence there is reconciliation through his death. Much more, being now reconciled, shall we be saved in his life. Hence also, the life of Christ avails more for salvation now than his death did before.

20. And not only so (i. e. not only do we rejoice in these great gifts of God, which commend the love of God toward us), but we also rejoice in God, (although) through our Lord, even Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation.

21. We rejoice therefore in faith in Christ; we rejoice in the hope of the sons of God; we rejoice in our tribulations; we rejoice in the death and the cross of Christ; we rejoice in the life and the resurrection of Christ; we rejoice in the reconciliation through him; we rejoice in Christ, the man; but, above all, we rejoice in God, who through Christ commendeth his love toward us.

22. For just as all these things are for our justification, (which nevertheless ultimately dependeth solely upon the purpose of God,) so also our glory is ultimately in God alone, who commendeth his own love toward us.

23. For if by the trespass of the one the many died, much more did the grace of God and the gift of the one man, Christ Jesus, abound unto the many.

24. And not as through one that sinned, so is the gift; for the judgment came of one unto condemnation, but the free gift came of many trespasses unto justification.

25. For if by the trespass of the one death reigned through the one, much more shall they that receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness

reign in life through the one, even Jesus Christ. So then as through the trespass of the one the judgment came unto all men to condemnation; even so through the righteousness of the one the free gift came unto all men to justification of life.

26. Here manifestly the sacrifice of the righteousness of the priest, Christ, justifieth and sanctifieth the people of God.

27. And as through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one are the many made righteous.

28. That, as sin reigned in death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Farrago

III

Concerning Ecclesiastical Dignity and Power. The True and Right Obedience, and How Far Those who are Subject to Prelates are Bound by Their Mandates and Statutes.

CONCERNING ECCLESIASTICAL DIGNITY AND POWER. THE TRUE AND RIGHT OBEDIENCE, AND HOW FAR THOSE WHO ARE SUBJECT TO PRELATES ARE BOUND BY THEIR MANDATES AND STATUTES.

That Subjects of the Pope are not bound to believe him unless he is Right in his Belief.

THE pope should—nay must—have his convictions, even as all the faithful must have theirs. When he believes what he should, the faithful are bound to assent to it, not simply because he believes it, but because it is what he should believe. If however, the belief of another is better than that of the pope, the pope himself ought to concur in it, even if it be that of a layman or a woman, not because it is a layman or woman that entertains this belief, but because he or she walks uprightly according to the truth of the gospel. So when Peter (Gal. II) did not walk uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, he was obliged to believe Paul, not because it was Paul, or he was under. Paul's authority, but because Paul walked more uprightly according to the truth of the gospel.

Hence we reach the conclusion: *That although it may be assumed that the pope and prelates, in view of the high station of dignity to which they have been raised, walk in the truth of the gospel more nearly than all others, and that therefore, other things being equal, they should be believed rather than any of those subject to them, nevertheless their subjects are not bound to believe them without reserve.* To deny this is

so unreasonable, so full of blasphemy, that it is actually more pernicious than any heresy whatever. For a prelate—even the highest prelate—may err, as did the first of them, although he was chosen expressly by the Lord Jesus and was filled with the Holy Spirit. Peter, however, was permitted by the Lord to err, that we might know that our faith is due not to a man but to the Holy Spirit. And rightly, for since faith is a theological virtue dependent solely upon God, it believes only in God, in whom alone the just shall live by faith. Indeed the life of the just would be greatly imperiled if it depended upon the life of the pope. For many of the highest pontiffs have erred harmfully. For example recently in the celebrated council of Constance, Benedict, Boniface and John XXIII unquestionably wrought great harm to the faith. Likewise in these last days much harm was done to the faith by Pius II and Sixtus IV, one of whom in open bulls laid claim to the kingdoms of the earth, while the other in the fullness of his authority issued the most shameful dispensations in leaden bulls, not only with regard to the obligation of an oath that had been taken in a civil case, but with regard to one that was yet to be taken, and thereby abused his apostolic power. Whatever Brother Pietro or Count Girolamo did out of insolence or greed, Sixtus himself, on learning of it afterwards, actually ratified by bulls with leaden seals.

> That the First Pope, Peter, erred and was corrected by Paul as an Example for All, in order that the Wise may know what to do with Salt which hath lost its Savor.

No pope has been wiser than Peter; none has had greater authority or sanctity than St. Peter. Therefore, if one has no right to say to the pope, "Why do you do thus?" or to censure or judge a pope, one ought least of all to

censure Peter. But I ask: If the pope is censurable and (as all who have the spirit of God's wisdom can readily see) does not walk uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, why should he not be censured? For the wisest and saintliest of popes was openly, in the presence of all, censured and reproached by one who was wiser and more saintly. Paul reproached him after the Holy Spirit had been received, just as before the Holy Spirit was given, when the eleven were at supper, the Lord Jesus reproached them for their unbelieving hearts. So now Paul reproaches Peter for his fear, his human weakness, his inconstancy, his being a stumbling block to the faithful, not only to the weak "little ones" but even to the righteous; as for example to Barnabas, the Apostle. And this he did to Peter's shame and open confusion.

But while this took place by divine dispensation in relation to Peter, yet it was done not merely on Peter's account, but by the grace of God plenarily for the comfort of the entire Church in every age. Peter indeed gained in charity and wisdom and humility, and the greater result of his complete defeat was that he rose stronger after his fall. And from Paul the wise all learned what should be done with the salt of the earth, if it should happen to lose its savor. For it is good for nothing but to be cast out and to be trodden under foot by those who are wiser,—nevertheless, only in so far as it hath lost its savor. And this statement is of the utmost importance in its bearing upon unworthy prelates of the Church.

How we are to interpret the Command to obey even Froward Masters.

The word "froward" in the canon of the blessed Apostle Peter,—"Servants, be obedient to your masters, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward,"—is not so absolutely binding upon servants as most people think.

For they infer that the condition of being servants makes it obligatory to obey all the orders of even wicked masters. This however arises from their misunderstanding the force of the Greek word here used, *dyscolus*, which—as applied to a master—means one under whose exactions it is hard to find leisure. Compare Matt. XIX, 23, "How hard —δυσκόλως—it is for a rich man to have leisure to enter the kingdom of heaven." It is obvious therefore that one must obey hard masters, but not evil masters, that is, those who command one to do wrong.

How the Statutes of Prelates of the Church should be received; when Prelates are to be tolerated or rejected.

When the Pharisees asked the Lord why his disciples transgressed the commands of the elders, he replied to them by propounding a more important question. And this is conducive to our instruction. For in doing this the Lord teaches us both by his opinion and his example: by his opinion, in order that we may know that the statutes of prelates of the church are not to be received as though they were God's commandments, since, if they were, the yoke of the Gospel would be heavier than the yoke of the Law; and also by his example, for he teaches us how the faithful on seeing the scandalous error of their superiors may inveigh against it, may reprove it,—if it be secret, secretly,—if open, openly. For in thwarting their attempts, the Lord held up their mistakes before their faces; and it is fitting that we should follow his example, lest unrestrained arrogance become so insolent in its authority that it cannot be arrested, checked or cut off.

Therefore as often as prelates sin impudently and persist arrogantly, thus making the further mistake of being shameless, they must be rejected in accordance with the Lord's example. Nevertheless it is to be noted that

according to the word of the Lord their salutary admonitions should not be despised. For as long as they sit in Moses' seat, what they say must be done. And they may be considered to occupy that seat, as long as their acts do not openly weaken their words. But when their lives are so scandalous that they corrupt by their example more than they edify by their speech, they are no longer to be tolerated. For they sit not in Peter's seat, but in the seat of the scornful. And in accordance with the example of the Lord in deeming it his duty to admonish them, all such should be rejected as useless and cast out because of their greater baseness.

That the Possession of Riches by the Church results in both Good and Evil.

It is a good thing for the Church to have great riches and temporal power and it would be better if she had more. For it is well to have great influence for good and the more the better.

It is a bad thing for the Church to have great riches and temporal power, not only because evil may result but because many evils do result therefrom. The early Fathers adopted a wrong course when they assumed judiciary power and accepted wealth. For secular princes wish the Church to provide out of her wealth for their followers, who are almost all corrupt. And if any of them are not corrupt at the start, they become so by first administering and then coveting her wealth.

Concerning Simony and Collations of Benefices, and whether the Pope does well to revoke them.

If a person, after obtaining any preferment whatsoever, may be convicted of simony on the ground that he has acquired money therefrom or has transferred it by sale,

it follows that he is not the owner of it. Hence canons are not the owners of benefices or of possessions resulting from benefices. Therefore they cannot present them to anyone. Nor may even the pope give them away or sell them or confer any right with regard to them, except the faithful management of them. He may commit their faithful management to persons, entrusting them with what they can faithfully administer. But unfaithful management cannot be tolerated even in the pope, unless it be to avoid a greater danger that is sure to follow. And certainly whatever else he does in the matter of benefices is wrong.

Therefore in revoking to himself the collation of benefices, he does but increase the account he must render. But when he sells gifts or services or anything resembling them to men who are dissolute and corrupt, he is not managing affairs in accordance with his sacred office. And when he commits God's interests in remote provinces to mere fortune as it were,—as if he had no concern for them,—then alas, what evils ensue,—as one cannot but see all about him!

How far the Statutes and Mandates of Men are Obligatory.

The venerable Gerson has sufficiently shown to what extent the hours and fast days that have been enjoined are obligatory. Nor is his conclusion regarding them overthrown by the objection that their observance is conditioned upon the most rational wisdom and that therefore they are not obligatory if they involve danger to health. Herein they are like the counsels of perfection in the gospel, which, while they are based upon the highest wisdom, were not intended by God to be obligatory upon the multitude of people, who are weak, except it be at the very end of life. For no one will enter the kingdom except through

the eye of a needle, like a dove through a hole in a rock.

Reason therefore supports the contention that the commands of prelates of the Church are obligatory only so far as they are based on wisdom; they are obligatory, I say, on condition that benefits follow their observance. Without regard to mortal sins, we hold that the weak cannot attain to the counsels of perfection in the gospel and thus truly become the sons of light; why then should we wish to cast a deadly noose without discrimination upon the weak multitude by requiring of them any more than is necessary?

Hence I am quite amazed at those who are ready to beget obligation out of admonition. For all ecclesiastical authority is as a compact between the physician and patient, i. e. it depends upon an agreement between both. For a pastor does not feed his flock unless his flock is fed; he does not save except so far as the sheep are cured; he does not bind except with the bonds of love; he does not loose except from Satan's bonds. This then is the power which the Church has received from the Lord, that when the pastor ministers faithfully and the flock obeys faithfully, both obtain the reward of their faithfulness. The power of the Church is conditioned upon the extent of its ability to furnish food; and also upon the understanding that it should provide only what is food for the flock.

Counsel on behalf of the Weak.

The weak are greatly helped—and not alone with respect to the fear of incontinency—by such words as these of the Apostle, "To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife. It is better to marry than to burn." And again, "Defraud ye not one the other, except it be by consent for a season, that ye may give yourselves unto

prayer, and may come together again, that Satan tempt you not."

When therefore, in like manner, other temptations—as, for example, to weakness, impatience, inconstancy—may be feared with good reason, it would be prudent to counsel weak souls humbly to adopt lower standards. For most people "it is vain to rise up early," but it is in accordance with the Lord's counsel "to tarry in the city until we are endued with power from on high."

Hence arises a great question, whether any such weak souls should be permitted to reject the Apostle's advice and whether the rejection of it renders it out of the question for them to return to the Apostle's counsel.

Now I believe that a foolish promise is displeasing to God, just as an impious vow in violation of one's welfare is not obligatory. For as the Apostle says, "To avoid fornication one must marry," so the Lord Jesus on account of the inconstancy of the weak says that in persecution "they must flee from one city into another." For such counsel in aid of weakness is the way to health, in so far as that which is not opposed to health makes for health, in accordance with the words, "He that is not against you is for you."

A pastor is appointed to feed the flock of God. But since the flock is possessed of reason and free choice, it is not absolutely given over to the power of the pastor so that nothing is required of it except to obey him. For a sheep of itself ought to know what its food is, with what it may be tainted, and how to avoid a poisonous taint, even if it is offered by the shepherd himself. And so it has no excuse if it follows the shepherd. Hence the people should follow their shepherd to pasture. But when he does not feed them, he is no shepherd. Then the flock is not bound to obey him, as he is not fulfilling his duty. Sometimes a good pastor commands what is right in the right way,

and then he must be obeyed. Sometimes he commands what is right—although not in the right way—and, as a rule, he must be obeyed in accordance with the word, "Do what they say; but whatever they do" etc. But if a good pastor, however good his purpose, commands through ignorance what is not right, and the flock knows what is right better than he does, he ought not to be obeyed. Especially is this the case, when he commands what is not right, and in a way that is not right.

> Love toward our Neighbor we owe to God, not to our Neighbor.

I have been commanded to love my neighbor. Therefore it is not to him I owe that love. For he did not put me under obligation to him by any law of his own and thus make me his debtor. I am a debtor only to God, who alone has put me under obligation by his own law. Now from this it is readily apparent how true the word of the penitential Psalm is, "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned."

Yet we are said to owe certain persons loyalty, reverence, gratitude, service, recompense. In his prayer the Lord says that certain persons are our debtors. And the apostle warns us to "owe no man anything except to love one another," admitting that mutual love at least is due to one another. But as it is impossible for a truth to contradict a truth and the two truths stated above are unquestionably in agreement, surely our final conclusions should be so stated as to lead to a sound and true opinion. Therefore to angels and prelates we owe reverence, to parents loyalty, to the beneficent gratitude, to the needy assistance, so far as we can offer it to them reasonably and advantageously. Not because it is due to them, but because we are debtors to God who enjoins this upon us, and because it is shown to be an advantage to them. Hence

this conclusion is complex, not simple; figurative in force, not immediate. Both the commandments as to loving God and our neighbor are God's commandments and obligatory by reason of his will. So all the commandments of the law simply constitute us debtors to God. Therefore I am not a debtor to man with regard to not killing or hating or slandering him. For the law was not made nor its obligation imposed by man.

Laws therefore, whether passed by common consent of the people or declared by prelates or princes or magistrates, are obligatory only in so far as they are included and enjoined in the divine law. In the divine law we are commanded to obey those placed over us, not to resist authority, to maintain peace with our fellow citizens, and many other such things, which are not attained except by keeping the laws of those in authority. Therefore we ought to obey them. We do not, however, owe the obedience itself to them, but we owe it to God that we should obey them, just as in loving them we are debtors to God, not to them.

From this we already see more clearly how we ought to obey the commands of those in authority,—that is we, as debtors to God, should obey them, provided they command nothing against God. For nothing ought to be done on God's account against God. Hence also it is easy to see the extent and nature of obligatory commands,—they must be approved by the conscience of both parties.

But it is otherwise when we have to do with a debatable or disputable obligation, since here each one is under obligation only so far as there is a bond of mutual affection and desire with reference to a good command. Thus every patient is obliged to obey a physician's command only so far as he desires it to result in his own good health, —if much, much; if little, but little. He is under little obligation to obey one whom he knows to be a foolish

physician, since in every case each person is obliged to obey a command only so far as he expects a good result from his obedience. And here the rule holds that one is not bound to keep a command when greater harm will result from keeping it than from disregarding or renouncing it.

So too the commands of the Grammarians may rightly be disregarded and neglected by needy boys, who find it more imperative to obtain money in order to live than to acquire a clear literary style. For if they attended school they would lose their health and life in securing clearness of speech; whereas if they do not obey their commands, they would only lack the ability to speak in a scholarly manner, with whatever advantage follows therefrom. So also with regard to the commands of logic, of philosophy, and of kings. In the case of the highest pontiffs also the rule holds that in a matter concerning one's welfare, one should obey the pontiff just as one obeys a physician in sickness, viz. on the assumption that one can rightly decide in regard to his commands. And when one cannot decide rightly and is in doubt, let him resort to the direction of one in whom he has perfect confidence.

How far Prelates must be obeyed by those under their Authority.

Most prelates of churches and monasteries are of the opinion, and it is in accord with the opinion of Holy Writ, that those under their authority should render them prompt obedience and that this is necessary to their salvation. And to establish their claim they cite the word, "Do ye whatsoever they say, but do ye not in accordance with their works." Obedience however should be closely analyzed, with reference to the desire of the person issuing the command as much as the nature of the command, with reference to the necessity of the command as much as its result and purpose. For it was the Lord's purpose that

through the wisdom of the person in authority, the inexperience and simplicity of those under his charge might be helped, to the end that they might advance and draw near unto God. God's design therefore in enjoining this command was that simple folk should search after this wisdom. But wisdom will not be the only result attained by those who are faithfully obedient. God's favor is also secured by prompt and humble obedience, unless it be utterly foolish and devoid of the wisdom of serpents.

A prelate is to be heeded only in so far as he displays wisdom. For he who next to the apostles heeds prelates, heeds Christ. When, therefore, they teach or command in accordance with Christ, they must be heeded as though Wisdom herself were speaking. Otherwise, they are not to be heeded, just as Paul did not heed Peter when he became a stumbling block to the Gentiles by compelling them to become Jews. Therefore prelates must be heeded in all that they say wisely, as if Wisdom were speaking from heaven, on account of the wisdom contained in their words. But they are not simply to be heeded on account of their pastoral authority.

Hence the canons and statutes of prelates have only as much force as they contain wisdom. Prelates have no right to issue commands under pain of mortal sin, except when the transgression in itself involves folly unto death. Hence in matters that have no moral significance as e. g. the decree of Pope Pius concerning alum, the faithful are not made liable to a sin unto death solely because it pleases the pope.

Explanation of the Lord's Word as to Heeding the Pharisees and Scribes, and its Limitations.

The word of the Lord Jesus concerning the Pharisees and scribes sitting in Moses' seat may be a stumbling block to many who talk without due reflection. Yet

if it be carefully considered, it will lead to the conclusion that it must be observed within its proper limits. For if we direct our attention to the scope of the command, we shall see that it is sufficiently restricted and limited at both ends. It is limited in the premise, because it refers to those "sitting in Moses' seat," i. e. teaching as Moses did. And likewise it is sufficiently limited in the conclusion, where it says, "do ye not after their works." For if we are not to do "after their works," surely when they become so shameless as to teach and speak after their own works, they are no longer to be sustained or heeded. And however broadly the Lord Jesus says, "whatsoever they bid you," no one who obeyed their words in accordance with their works would be excusable. For in speaking thus, they are sitting not in Moses' seat but in the seat of the scornful, since they do not speak as did Moses, who was inspired by the Holy Spirit. Yet even corrupt men may speak in accordance with Moses, although they may not think as he did, even as a dead book may direct a living person and a dead manuscript must be read; so also the sayings of a dead scribe or a dead Pharisee may have their influence. The Apostle enjoins us to "prove all things, but to hold fast to that which is good." We are therefore commanded to do and observe all things whatsoever they say, not in accordance with their corrupt inclination but in accordance with the correct standard of Moses' seat. Otherwise we are not commanded to do or observe what they say.

Concerning True and Right Obedience.

Obedience, if it be rightly rendered, is a part of righteousness. For the just command of a superior ought always to be obeyed by one who is under his authority. And, since the commandments of God are always just,

they must always be obeyed. But indiscriminate obedience to the commands of others indicates lack of discernment. The Apostle declared that not even the angels from heaven were to be obeyed if they announced or preached any gospel other than that which the Galatians had received.

Everyone who issues a command wishes to be obeyed, but all who command are not led by the same spirit. A holy prelate wishes obedience because he hopes it will be of service to the one who obeys. A corrupt prelate wishes the obedience of those under his authority in order that he may rule according to his pleasure. Certain persons who do not discriminate between these carelessly and recklessly say that obedience must always be rendered, and that if no other fruit results from such prompt obedience, it is sufficient that one abnegate his will,—as if the abnegation of one's will were always a good thing! And they cite the word of Bernard, "Nothing will burn in hell except one's own will." These persons do not know that everyone's will will there be broken. It is of no advantage to a person to have his will broken, unless the will of his superior remains unbroken.

But others think that disobedience disturbs and injures monastic or ecclesiastic peace and thereby love. Love, they say, must always be observed, therefore obedience is always necessary. If however these persons would weigh the word love with any discernment, they would not express so rash an opinion in regard to indiscriminate obedience. For there is a love of God and a love of men. And in loving men care must be exercised to further their greater good, even if in doing so their lesser interests suffer. Fraternal peace, if it can be preserved with fraternal love, ought always to be sought. Yet, just as in a storm grain is cast out of a ship, so when love is imperiled, the temporary peace of the household must be cast out. Peace

must not be kept with the erring, with the impure, with the ignoble, with the profane,—for "what communion hath light with darkness?" Hence it is not always necessary to obey everyone who issues a command, either in order to secure peace or to abnegate one's will.

How the Word, "Be Subject to Every Ordinance of Man for the Lord's Sake," is to be understood.

Peter says, "Be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake." This word is to be understood as referring principally to those in high position, for the faithful among the common people ought to be subject to their prelates, not only believing their teaching, but also obeying their commands. Nevertheless they are to remember that they are under obligation to do these things "for the Lord's sake." That is, that they should exercise faith first of all toward God and the gospel, that they should render obedience first of all to God. Hence in whatsoever the people believe their pastor, if their belief is sound, they believe it because it conforms to the gospel. And if they think their pastor is asserting something that conflicts with the gospel, and is contrary to the law, they should neither believe him nor obey him. "To be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake" is simply to believe one's pastor for the gospel's sake, to obey his commands and follow his example for the sake of the law. For the gospel contains the truth, the law contains commands and important precedents which we are to follow, obeying the words of the gospel as well as doing the commands of the law.

Hence we may judge how far a teacher by virtue of his office is to be subject to a prelate in matters of belief. For if he is truly a teacher, trained and disciplined as he should be, he ought by reason of his trained intelligence to know as much or more of sacred literature than those who

are not teachers, than prelates who are not thus disciplined. And this is evident not only from the necessity of the case, but even more from the facts. Furthermore, he who has a thorough knowledge of theological truth, should not be subject to one who claims to know more but knows less in matters of belief. For in matters of belief we are all primarily under the authority of the gospel, so that neither an angel from heaven nor even St. Paul through his epistle is to be believed, if the teaching of either is at variance with the gospel.

As regards precedents, the Church has changed somewhat, e. g. in the time, place and measure of the breaking of bread, because of differences in its purpose and result among earlier and later Christians,—not that the Church has changed the precedent of the Lord's Supper, for this had been immutably established, but that it changed the original manner of its celebration. So also it has changed certain commands of the law. But it has never presumed to change the gospel. For whenever the Church has believed that a matter of imitation or obedience was subject to change—and has therefore changed it, it has done so for the sake of the unchangeable truth of the gospel. For the gospel is a light to obedience and imitation. Hence the urgent necessity (both for him who truly knows the gospel and for the gospel itself) that no host of opponents, no lofty title should influence one who knows the gospel to disbelieve it. For it is for God's sake that we believe the gospel, and it is for the gospel's sake that we believe the Church and the pope. But we do not believe the gospel for the Church's sake. For the teaching of Augustine concerning the gospel and the Church has to do with the beginning of his belief and does not involve any comparison between the gospel and the Church or any preference for the authority of the Church. The Lord Jesus said to the apostles, "Preach ye to all creatures, teaching them to

observe whatsoever I commanded you." Therefore they were not to be heeded except so far as they were sent; they were not sent except with the gospel; they did not evangelize except in accordance with the gospel.

But when any single person finds himself opposed by a whole multitude in a matter relating to the gospel, it is more probable that he is mistaken rather than the learned men of the entire Church, and therefore, whoever he may be, he should suspect himself and dread to be in error. Nevertheless, knowing that it is not impossible for many learned men to be mistaken, he ought always in the first place to reflect upon the apparent truth of the gospel. In the second place he ought to search carefully into the truth and understanding of the gospel. In the third place he ought diligently to consider the reasons of his opponents; and then to hold firmly to that side which he shall find to be closer to the gospel.

How Christ's Words with Regard to Heeding the Scribes and Pharisees are to be understood.

From the words of the Lord Jesus, "The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all things therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, these do and observe," many prelates of the church extract an erroneous and false interpretation. For they think that these words have given them authoritative power to oblige the disciple to observe and do what they say. And others err in regard to the scope of these words. For they think of the widest application of the words, "whatsoever they bid you, that do and observe." The latter class is the more easily led back to the truth. For it is easy to see that not "all the words which they say" ought to be observed and done. Certainly the crafty and treacherous words of the scribes and Pharisees, distinctly and persistently uttered before the people, were not to be observed and done. Nor were

their blasphemies, when they said that the Lord Jesus cast out demons by Beelzebub, the prince of the demons; or when they said: "Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is a debtor." Now if the Lord Jesus calls them fools and blind for saying such things, can we be so silly as to follow these foolish and stupid leaders? Perhaps they will reply that when the Lord Jesus spoke thus he did not remember what he had said before; or, when he made the earlier statement, he did not foresee what he would say afterwards. For later he bids them "beware of the leaven of the Pharisees," which he explains in the context as "the hypocrisy of their teaching." The same Lord, therefore, who commands them to do and observe all things whatsoever they say, commands them to beware of the leaven of their teaching.

It follows that he who hears the scribes and Pharisees ought to be as simple as a dove in seeking nothing but good grain. But, besides, he ought to be prudent and wise, and so far-seeing and astute as to know that he is to prove all the statements of the scribes and Pharisees and hold fast to only what is good. The power of discrimination should characterize all faithful hearers. The scribes and Pharisees had no authority to command such as the high priest had, being lower in rank; for they sat not upon the tribunal or throne, but in the chair of instruction, just as teachers and preachers among us do.

Now the first of the errors mentioned above, though less broad in its scope than the second, involves more difficulty on account of the governing power conceded to those in authority. Nevertheless men of clear discernment must see that the standard laid down for the people in adopting the commands of prelates is the same as that in regard to heeding the teaching of the corrupt. For they ought to observe and do the commands both of prelates and of

learned men according to the admonition of Paul, i. e. only so long as they sit in Moses' seat and speak in harmony with Moses. And whatsoever they say beyond or against this is not especially binding upon the faithful against the law of perfect liberty. For we are servants of God, not of the pope, whose servants we would be, if we had to obey his every command. It has been said moreover, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou serve."

Concerning the Blindness and Folly of the Pharisees.

"And he that sweareth by the temple, sweareth by him that dwelleth therein. And he that sweareth by the heaven, sweareth by the throne of God and by him that sitteth thereon." (Matt. XXIII, 21–22.) Indeed he that sweareth by any creature of God, sweareth by its creator.

If in a case of this kind the foolish and blind scribes and Pharisees speak and teach anything to the contrary, are they (on account of the words cited above) to be heeded at all when they oppose the true and only Teacher? Surely they are to be heeded only when they teach in accordance with him and lead men to him. For no one, unless he is blind, follows a foolish and blind leader. Here the Lord Jesus intimates, not only that the Pharisees are leaders characterized by folly and blindness, but also that the very people that are led by them are like them. For he says, "Foolish and blind leaders of the blind." Certainly whoever follows one who is foolish and blind is himself foolish and blind. When the leaders did not dare to answer the questions of the Lord Jesus concerning the baptism of John, and wished to lay hands on him, they did not dare to do so for fear of being stoned by the crowd, which was then praising him. But on the morrow, which was

the day before the Sabbath, the crowd did not restrain the mad attempt of those headstrong men by threatening to stone them. Hence the mob was properly censured by St. Augustine and made to share in the crime against Christ.

After threatening the scribes and Pharisees with the seven woes, the Lord Jesus includes under the name Jerusalem all those who lay claim to learning and pastoral office, and yet do not provide truth and righteousness. For he says, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them which are sent unto thee." That he includes only such false leaders under this name is clear from the words of the context when he adds, "How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings and ye would not!" Here clearly there are three parties:— first, "Jerusalem"; second, "the children of Jerusalem"; third, "the Lord Jesus, who would gather the children as a hen." The second consists of the children of Jerusalem who are to be gathered under the wings of the hen. The third consists of those who are unwilling that the chickens should be gathered under the wings of the hen, seducers and blind and foolish pastors and teachers.

Now I ask: When the hen wishes to gather her chickens, and any of these teachers and pastors of the third class, oppose and contradict her, to whom ought the chickens to give heed, even though the Lord Jesus says, "All whatsoever they bid you, that observe and do"? Surely unless the chickens are blind and foolish, they will flee to the wings of the hen, no matter how much our hireling rails at the true shepherd!

But why then did the Lord Jesus give the last statement so wide a scope? Was it not in order to exercise our diligence in comparing the Scriptures, in comparing passages mutually agreeing and demonstrating the truth? For

otherwise we would not apply our minds to ascertain the truth of a statement by the exercise of thought, and be rewarded by the development of our own wisdom and truth.

Christ's Opinion as to when Preachers and Pastors ought not to be heeded.

Especially noteworthy is the opinion of our Lord Jesus Christ, given in the final discourse of the whole gospel (Matt. XXIII), from which we conclude that teachers, preachers and pastors are not to be heeded when they teach, preach and feed their flocks contrary to their obligation and duty. For he asserts that they are ostentatious *hypocrites*, doing all their works to be seen of men,—*ambitious*, seeking the chief place at feasts and the chief seats in the synagogues,—*vain*, delighting in empty show, desiring to be saluted in the market places and to be called of men, "Rabbi,"—*avaricious*, devouring widows' houses, —*false*, seizing every opportunity and pretext for making long prayers,—*corrupt and pestilent*, in that although they have the authority of the kingdom entrusted to them, they neither exercise the ministry of piety themselves nor suffer others who wish to exercise it faithfully to do so; the Lord Jesus reproaches them with this when he says: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, because ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men; for ye enter not in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering in to enter" etc.,—*false teachers*, teaching the people false doctrines against the truth of saving faith, e. g. that those who shall swear by the temple and by the altar are not bound by it; but whoso sweareth by the gift that is laid upon the altar is bound by his oath,—*perverse*, straining out the gnat and swallowing the camel, disregarding the weightier matters of the law, but severe and insistent about the lesser,—strict exactors of the com-

mands of men, but trampling upon the will of God, unwilling that those under their authority should be gathered under the wings of the hen that would cherish and save them.

Since they are men of this sort, what shall those do who are under their authority, men to whom the kingdom of heaven has come nigh? Which of the two are they to follow, those who enter not in themselves neither suffer those wishing to enter,—or him, who throughout life is always mercifully near to gather them like chickens under his wings? Surely under such conditions they are bound to heed the mother hen, and not false, vain, ostentatious, ambitious, avaricious, perverse, pseudo-teachers, pestilent preachers, foolish, blind prelates, leaders of the blind.

Nevertheless those under authority are bound to uphold such men in their ministry, so long as they themselves can do and observe what such men may say rightly and sanely. But when they speak and teach wickedly, the people ought not to obey them unless they are willing to be blind followers of the blind, to be shut out from the wings of the hen and the kingdom of heaven and to be corrupted and poisoned by pestilent men. For are they not pestilent and deadly, when the Lord Jesus calls them serpents and a generation of vipers? The Apostle, too, distinctly says that "evil communications corrupt good manners." But whose communications are more evil than those of corrupt teachers, pastors, presbyters, prelates? Their discourse creeps on stealthily like a crab, and not only their discourse but their bad example. For every evil is prone to be imitated. But "whoso," be he pope or any other pastor, "shall offend one of these little ones," i. e. shall obstruct his progress in righteousness along the ways of God, either through perverse doctrines, neglect of his ministry, or corrupt example, "it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck and that he were drowned in

the depth of the sea" rather than that he thus pestilently direct and corrupt his flock.

> Every Prelate who offends the Little Ones is Antichrist.

Everyone, therefore, no matter how high his station, in so far as he, opposing the will of Christ, offends the "little ones" and hinders them in the straight paths of truth and life is Antichrist. Indeed every such person in opposition to Christ is trying clearly to destroy those for whom Christ shed his blood. For in destroying those whom Christ through his death endeavors to save, what else is he doing but opposing Christ? Christ wills to save men through their obedience. But many prelates through their disobedience of the commandments and their corrupt example do not hesitate to offend in the various ways recounted to the multitude by the Lord Jesus in Matt. XXIII.

If these things are true, and until I am better instructed I must believe that they are true, every good man for the reasons cited above ought to admonish the "little ones" lest they stumble. For if they be not warned against the baseness and the pestilent and corrupt example of prelates in every particular, they will be unable to avoid them. It is true that if we point out these evils, we shall forthwith arouse these hypocritical, ostentatious, ambitious, vain, enticing, avaricious prelates not only against us but also against the people committed to their charge. Nevertheless the Lord Jesus, who forbade common scandal, publicly declared before the multitude the shameless deeds of all who were causing them to stumble, not only uncovering their shamelessness but threatening them with everlasting woe. (Matt. XXIII.)

Now if one wishes to follow the example of the Lord Jesus, he must remember that, when the Lord Jesus made

this assertion, he was already prepared to bear the cross. Whoever therefore is unwilling to follow his example, will allow secret scandals to bear fruit everywhere. It must be admitted that a remedy may be more harmful than the disease, because of the perilous times. But why are these perilous times unless because the life of the prelates of the Church is everywhere corrupt? Although the Lord Jesus said these things to the scribes and Pharisees, yet it was not for the sake of men at that time, from whom the kingdom of heaven was to be withdrawn soon afterwards; but his teaching looked forward to the distant future, being written for our sakes, who are threatened with a like danger because our pastors, preachers and teachers are not sound in doctrine. For at the close of the twenty-fourth chapter the Lord Jesus expressly mentions two kinds of servants who are to be made rulers over his household. Some he says are faithful and prudent, giving meat to the household in due season. But others, relying wickedly and foolishly on the delay of their Lord, are evil servants who eat and drink and are arrogant and exercise tyranny over their fellow servants. Whoever is corrupted by the example of the latter, so that he falls into a pit with them, will not be excused for his ignorance or blindness or folly. If anyone is caused to stumble through his blindness and folly, he is indeed blind and foolish, since he blindly approves their corruption and follows them in it. But he who is offended by sound doctrine and good example so that he is made worse, he is not to be regarded as one of the "little ones," but as among the scribes and Pharisees in rejecting the counsels of wisdom. He stones and kills the prophets. At his destruction Wisdom will rejoice and laugh. Therefore in general the cause of offence is twofold: first, that which offends the "little ones"; second, that which offends the Pharisees; concerning the latter the Lord Jesus says that it is better that they should

be offended than that the truth be passed over in silence. The "little ones" are caused to stumble because of evil, the Pharisees because of good.

Sometimes a person is chosen to rule who is not selected for his wisdom, but whose authority rests solely upon his high station and power. But since no authority is given against wisdom and truth, one must not submit to blind leadership. For he who follows a blind leader and falls into a pit on account of the leader's blindness does not fall any the less because his leader possessed authority.

How far those under Authority are obliged to obey their Prelates and Superiors.

It is worth while to consider how much one under authority owes to his prelate, how much an inferior owes to his superior. For this obligation is not absolutely binding, but is rather in the nature of a compact with the prelate. The latter is not the overlord of an inferior, although his inferior may call him lord and sometimes for good reasons submit himself to him. Nevertheless if he, who according to the terms of the compact is the superior, does not deal fairly with respect to the law of compacts, then the one under his authority is not bound by an unimpaired obligation. But so far as the former fulfills the law as a superior, the inferior is bound to discharge his obligation to him. Hence if the prelate utterly casts the law aside, the person under his authority is bound by no obligation whatever. For all such submission ought to be voluntary and spontaneous. Therefore one should not accede to it except after due deliberation. Now deliberation involves the consideration of both cause and result. Therefore when this consideration, by which one party is induced to enter into a contract, is disregarded by the other party, there is no longer any obligation resting on the first party. For usually the nature of this obliga-

tion is such that those under authority elect as their superior a person in whom they suppose they will most nearly attain the result and cause of their deliberation. The Mendicants in electing a superior seem to act more cautiously than any other order. For they renew the election every year without necessarily electing a new superior; if however he proves to be a man to whom they cannot safely entrust themselves, they can elect a better in his place. And if perchance they choose a worse, they can get rid of him also.

What, therefore, is represented as a marriage between the bishop and the Church (the one being the bridegroom, the other the bride) is a solemn sacrament of pledged faith, but it is not an indissoluble bond. Otherwise in no case could a complaint give room for divorce. In reality the bishop is not a bridegroom; he ought to be a groomsman, although frequently he is not. Therefore such men ought always to be deposed from their high station when they are unworthy of authority. They are however always unworthy when they are unfruitful. Yet they are kept in office for fear of making matters worse, just as prostitutes are kept in cities.

Such also should be the treatment of kings. Hence, too, in every well constituted republic the highest magistrate should be restrained from arrogance by fixing a limit either to his term or his authority; so that he can rule only for a year or by a consensus of votes. For what does an election signify unless the voter is free to choose? Obedience is due the better man and the election should point to him. In so far as the election fails to secure such a man, in so far he is not to be obeyed. Hence, too, the righteous, so far as they can honorably do it, should withdraw from such men and seek and obtain exemption in many things in accordance with a common right. On this ground kings should not be obeyed in evil measures;

more than that, they may be justly driven from their thrones, unless there is danger that still greater evils would result. For obviously cost and labor are lost when a blow already received is patched up by a worse wound.

That one should agree with a Wise Man rather than the Pope.

When a wise man differs with the pope, one should stand by or agree with the wise man rather than the pope. For the pope cannot absolve from a sentence of excommunication pronounced by a wise man. Such a sentence is the following, "If any man loveth not the Lord Jesus, let him be anathema." The pope cannot absolve from this sentence, nor can he release one who is bound by it. For everyone remains cut off from God and excommunicated in so far as he does not love God. Though he may be in a state of salvation and grace, still he does not share in that nuptial communion of embraces and kisses, of which he who loves God is conscious. For there is a great difference between desiring, esteeming, and loving. Hence he who fears God is excluded from the class of those who desire God; he who desires him from those who esteem him; and he who esteems him from the sublimity and dignity of those who love him.

What is to be done when the Pope and the Wise Man contradict each other.

In case of disagreement and contradiction between the pope and a wise man, not only is the pope bound to heed and follow the wise man, but the latter in matters in which he is truly wise, i. e. in which he is entrusted with the expression of true wisdom in accord with the immaculate law of God, should by no means forsake his opinion and follow papal authority. But, more than that, whenever

the whole Church of the faithful recognizes the unerring expression of wisdom, it ought similarly to follow the wise man. This was done recently in the Council of Constance, when the faithful disagreed with John XXIII and agreed with John Gerson; and if in our day Eugene and Bernard of Clairvaux contradicted and disagreed with each other, who would not side with Bernard rather than with Eugene? Indeed this point is strongly confirmed by the example of Eugene, who so readily accepted the many severe admonitions and reproofs contained in the "*De Consideratione.*"

So it belongs to a theologian to define how far the commands of pontiffs are obligatory,—yet on condition that he be a true theologian. "Who is he? and we will praise him." Therefore the church as a whole is bound by the consensus of the wise rather than by the direction of prelates. For the consensus of wise men is effectually directed by God. The guidance of prelates is often not so directed, as when the blind lead the blind or abandon them or suffer them to err.

That frequently a True Pope is a Pseudo-apostle; a True Prelate is a False Pastor.

A true prelate is one who sits in Peter's seat by legitimate title. Now it is agreed that a just title is one which results either from canonical election or from the collation of a superior. It follows therefore that frequently a true pope is a false apostle, a true prelate a false pastor, a true president a false bishop. Hence the people must often tolerate false apostles and evangelists, false bishops, false pastors. Otherwise a worse schism would result.

If a Pope does not edify he becomes simply a Peril.

A pope should be a prudent and faithful servant, like a skilful and careful physician in his relation to a patient.

Hence, just as an unskilful or careless physician only increases the patient's peril, so with the high pontiff, if what he does is lacking in faithful and wise integrity or is contrary to it, it amounts to nothing. For he has been appointed to edify; and when he does not edify, he does nothing. If he who is appointed to manage, does not manage faithfully, he indeed squanders. Under a drunken and faithless hireling the flock must perish. Therefore notwithstanding his promise of safe guidance, none of the flock will wisely trust a drunken, drowsy shepherd. The Lord Jesus delivered the keys of the kingdom of heaven to Peter and the apostles; but there is a wide difference between them and our prelates. For a wise and faithful servant, set over the family of his master, gives them their measure of wheat in due season, i. e. he provides them with the most nourishing food, and being anxious to foster their every virtuous desire, he is most watchful in caring for them, leading them by prayer, doctrine and good example, and helping those under him as a wise and worthy leader is wont to assist his people. Our prelates, on the contrary, are characterized by negligence, lasciviousness, carelessness, ostentation, self-importance, censoriousness, severity, heedlessness in issuing their mandates, anxiety to retain their preferment. These characteristics I do not regard as keys of the kingdom of heaven, but rather as the Pharisees' key, with which they neither enter themselves—since they cannot enter by any such qualities—nor do they suffer others to enter, corrupting and hindering them by their bad example. However much they may strive for the key of authority—and for this they rightly strive since indeed it is a key,—there is the greater and truer key of piety, without which the key of authority is of no avail. And wherever it is, it always finds the key of authority joined with it. If Peter and Paul had possessed the qualities of our prelates they never could have opened

the door of the kingdom of heaven to the Gentiles; nor could they have led them, as they did, by their own wisdom, zeal and example, or have freed them from the yoke of bondage and corruption.

This is clear from the fact that those who are most intimate with the prelates are most like them in character. For in all cathedral, collegiate churches, where the fatter benefices are, one always finds that those who have the iron keys are originally from the house of the pope and the cardinals. What sort of edification can they provide except that in which they were trained in the school from which they have come?

With an arrogance like that of the cardinals, Peter with the apostles and disciples could never have opened the door of the kingdom even in Jerusalem, then under a Roman ruler and priesthood; nor in Antioch; nor could he in Rome, if opposed by Nero and the senate, except by greater force of arms. I mean the door of the kingdom of heaven, though he might perhaps have opened an entrance for his own kingdom. But after love was shed abroad in their hearts through the Holy Spirit and they were established through love, and through love and courage they were inspired to preach the gospel and suffer for the salvation of believers, the Lord cooperated with them, so that the door of salvation and of the kingdom was opened to believers. And yet Peter did not bestow inward faith, but only externally sowed the word of the gospel, from which one derives no more grace or wisdom or righteousness than from a written or printed book.

Interpretation of the Apostle's Word, "There is no Power, but of God."

There should be no perfunctory, superficial reading or understanding of the Apostle's word to the Romans: "There is no power, but of God: and the powers that be

are ordained of God. Therefore he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God." For those who possess power over both the body and the soul may err, and err so grievously as to cause those under their authority to stumble in the path of God, and to throw those who obey them into fatal error. This is shown in the case of the Roman Emperors, persecutors of Christian faith and piety, who were resisted by St. Lawrence and St. Vincent with courageous firmness. Nay more, if the people roused by piety had taken up arms in rebellion against those furious Emperors and had thus checked their madness, I could not count them guilty of a mortal sin. Indeed Augustine charges the murder of the Lord to the tacit consent of the people in not resisting the leaders when they were plotting against him. And Jerome openly asserts that pious folk do harm in the Church of God in so far as they do not resist those who are bent on destroying it. Ambrose and Gregory also are of the opinion that whoso ceases to resist manifest crime cannot but be secretly uneasy from the consciousness of being in league with it. Pernicious power must therefore be resisted, unless we are willing to be secretly allied with it.

Hence the words of the Apostle, in the light of what he himself says elsewhere with some modification, must be interpreted to mean: "There is no power, but for edification." For in so far as power edifies, it is from God; but when it does not edify, whoever edifies by resisting it, has the power to resist from God. It follows that the ability to edify is power from God. And he who edifies more than another possesses the greater power. Hence Paul possesses more real power than Peter; Bernard more than Innocent or Eugene; Francis more than Honorius. Those who are under the authority of a prelate are commanded to warn him. "Say to Archippus, Take heed to thy ministry, that thou fulfil it." Nay more, they are

commanded to "withdraw themselves from every brother that walketh turbulently and disorderly." Therefore especially from a corrupt prelate.

A Corrupt Clergy is most Ruinous to the Church.

No one ruins the Church more than a corrupt clergy. Those who ruin the Church should be resisted by all Christians, even the very humblest, e. g. the peasants, according to the word, "However much a pious peasantry may build up the Church of God by the excellence of their lives, they harm it quite as much if they do not resist those who are ruining it."

The Arrogance of Prelates and Princes arises from the Worthlessness and Folly of the People.

All the error, all the license, all the arrogance of prelates, princes and kings have their origin in the wickedness, worthlessness and folly of the people. This is quite clear from all good and great states, where princes are not allowed much license. It is clearer from well governed monasteries of the best clergy, where the prelate understands that he is not allowed to do anything beyond what is right, and where, if he were to think otherwise, he would not be tolerated long. But it is made most clear by the act of John the Baptist in censuring the king concerning things that were not lawful and in resisting his arrogance. And if the greater part of the people had possessed his wisdom, they would not have retained the king as their sovereign, unless he reformed. Such men, therefore, and indeed all princes of this sort, are hatched out of the people's sins,—the nest, as it were, in which they originate.

No wonder then that the viper is bitten by its own offspring, that the people through the perversion of justice by the prince in external matters suffer loss of piety and

harsh serfdom, since they have no sense of their own loss of piety and reverence for God. Let them suffer in external matters, in order that by feeling these outward hardships deeply they may be brought to listen and understand, until at last they shall feel the greater loss of inward blessings.

Concerning the Dispensation granted by Prelates; on what it is based; when it is not Necessary; and why it is sought.

That there are not only differences, but indeed classes in the imperative commandments, was recognized by the Jewish scribes before the gospel was declared. But the Lord Jesus makes this matter clear by an utterance from his own lips, when he says, "The first of all the commandments is, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul," etc. "This is the first commandment and the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." And when the scribe admitted that these were more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices, the Lord Jesus commended him for admitting the truth, saying that he was not far from the kingdom of God. It is true that these two commandments are more than all whole burnt offerings. But this classification in respect to importance has such force that, in case two commandments of the law coincide, the greater and first commandment always excludes obligation to the lesser. For there is no contradiction in God's law and therefore no perplexity for the servants of God. And upon this solid truth is based all the right of dispensation on the part of prelates. Nay more, since there can be no contradiction in the law of God and therefore no perplexity for his servants, every faithful servant of God—quickly setting aside any dispensation whatever with regard to the lesser commandment—is bound to carry out the greater com-

mandment at once, when he cannot obey both. The Lord Jesus pointed out our duty in such cases by what he says with regard to honoring one's parents and with regard to offering gifts; the former being natural and necessary, the latter voluntary and free. For to supply the necessities of parents and the needs of one's neighbors is more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices, even if one has dedicated the sacrifice by an oath-bound pledge. But when a dispensation is sought in such matters it is the result either of fear arising from one's own ignorance or of trouble from some other source.

The Farrago

IV

Concerning the Sacrament of Penance; and What the Keys of the Church Are; Concerning the Power of Binding and Loosing.

CONCERNING THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE; AND WHAT THE KEYS OF THE CHURCH ARE; CONCERNING THE POWER OF BINDING AND LOOSING

Dr. Wessel, in a Letter to Engelbert of Leyden concerning the Power of Binding and Loosing, writes:

It is true that Peter and all the apostles had the power of binding and loosing on earth; but this they had in the exercise of their ministry, not of their authority. They had the power to provide the words of the gospel, and to believers they could minister the mysteries of grace, the sacraments of charisms, and the precepts of salvation. All who received these dutifully were truly loosed from the bonds of captivity to the devil. But I do not believe that Peter possessed the right either to loose whomsoever he pleased from the bond of Satan or to bind him therewith. For just as there is but one that baptizes in the Holy Spirit, so there is but one that binds and looses,—binds, I say, and looses with authority. For with what authority can the pope loose, when he does not know whether the person he has loosed has been loosed from the bond of Satan or not?

Concerning the Infallible Key to the Church, An Extract from a Letter concerning Indulgences addressed to M. Jacobus Hoeck, Dean of Naeldwick.

You, therefore, cautiously take refuge behind a *condition* as though behind an impregnable wall, declaring that

only that will stand unshaken which the pope in matters of this sort shall decide, "*if* his key is not in error and Christ does not reject it." What, I ask, is the meaning of this indispensable condition, "if his key is not in error"? What is this key of the kingdom of heaven? And what is the error of this key? You are obviously assuming a key that may err and at the same time be the effectual and lawful key of the kingdom, the key of the kingdom of heaven. O dreadful kingdom, if its gates, bars, bolts and keys are such that through them error, falsehood and ignorance can creep stealthily within!

The key, as Augustine explains, is love diffused through the Holy Spirit in the hearts of the children of the kingdom. The Lord Jesus before his resurrection promised these two keys to Peter when he said: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." In like manner he presented these keys after the resurrection—not to one—but to all unitedly, when he breathed on them, saying: "Receive ye the Holy Spirit: whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."

These two keys, in Augustine's opinion, are never rejected by Christ, nor does it ever happen that they are in error. For he defines the keys of the kingdom as being: (1) love diffused through the Holy Spirit in the hearts of the children of God, and (2) the Holy Spirit. And he says that to loose and to bind is to receive into fellowship because of the similitude of love or to exclude from fellowship because of its dissimilitude. And since to receive into the fellowship of similitude belongs to godliness rather than to authority, therefore not one among all the saints is prevented either by sex or condition from binding and

loosing; nor is this binding ever rejected by Christ, since it never happens that it is in error.

If, however, you mean that his key is in error when he to whom the keys have been entrusted is in error, I do not dispute that. For I cling unswervingly to Augustine's opinion as expressed above, in which there is no fear of ambiguity arising from any wavering words. Nay, I entirely agree with your opinion, provided it be first admitted that even the most holy pope, Peter, greatly erred, in order that the Church thereafter might know that it was not bound by the conclusions of high pontiffs, but that in case of disagreement every believer should be bound by the example of St. Paul, in defence of the faith, to resist the pope to his face and, if necessary, in the presence of all.

You cite the word of that venerable man, Thomas de Cursellis, who is of the opinion that the statement made to Peter was, "whatsoever thou shalt loose," not, "whatsoever thou shalt say." And you did well to cite his opinion, which is in the interest of truth; nevertheless it does not make the matter sufficiently clear. For in order that Christ's word might become perfectly clear and indubitable, there ought to have been a further statement as to how and by what means Peter could bind and loose. I therefore interpret the word thus: If a minister of Christ administers the word of faith or the sacrament of faith or the example of love in accordance with the teaching of Christ and the gospel, both those under his authority and those who hear him should faithfully believe that through his ministry of faith and piety he truly does loose and bind on earth what is loosed and bound in heaven; and if he attempts to loose or bind in any other way, what he does is of no avail. I think Peter and his successors were promised nothing but the salutary ministry of piety. And I shall hold to this, until a sounder doctrine is propounded to me by you or by others.

I am not a little horrified at your admonition that the pope's authority ought to have more weight with me than reason. Did the theological faculty at Paris regard the authority of Pope Clement of greater weight than reason—or even of any value whatever compared to reason—when they rebuked and corrected him for his temerity in laying commands upon angels in heaven; in responding to the prayers and wishes of the faithful by granting them the release of three or four souls from purgatory; and also in issuing indulgences remitting punishment and guilt? Nevertheless leaden bulls authorizing these errors are found to-day. Yet you admonish me in matters of this sort to regard the authority of the pope, not merely as a substitute for reason, but as superior to it! What, I ask, am I to regard as reason in these matters? Is it not the Holy Scriptures? Do you wish to put the authority of the pope above the Holy Scriptures? The will of the pope and the authority of Scripture have not been placed on an equal footing, since the will of the pope must be regulated in accordance with the truth of the Scriptures, not the truth in accordance with the will of the pope.

But to this foundation for your admonition, as though it were insufficient, you add the authority of the prelates. And lest anything should be lacking at the top, you further add that of the Doctors. To cite the authority of the prelates, in my opinion, adds nothing to the argument. . . . As for the Doctors, most of them would say that the granting of indulgences, to whatever extent, is a question that ought not to be regarded lightly, but to be discussed in faith, hope, and the love of Christ. And I too think it ought not to be regarded lightly. For in faith, hope, and the love of Christ I sincerely prize the gifts of the keys to the Church.

. . . . . .

And that the foregoing words of Augustine are not opposed to the words of the Lord, "Whatsoever ye shall bind," etc., is shown by Magister in the fourth chapter. For his interpretation of the words is: "Not whomsoever ye shall wish to bind or think of binding, but those on whom ye exert the true operation of righteousness and mercy." And in no other sense do I recognize your work upon sinners, etc.

. . . . . .

In accordance with this opinion of Augustine, which is in agreement with the former statement, to loose and to retain sins is principally the work of God alone. Yet through the gift of the Holy Spirit who principally forgives and retains sin the Church participates in it. And he adds: "Therefore sins are forgiven through the Church, when anyone joins the Church of the saints; and sins are retained through the Church, when anyone forfeits the love of the Church, being united to it or excluded from it by the Spirit of God which was given to the Church, through whom order and administration and government are maintained in the Church," etc.

. . . . . .

Concerning the foregoing, Magister cites St. Jerome in these words: "Certain persons, not understanding this point, infer from the arrogance of the Pharisees that priests can either condemn the innocent or forgive the guilty, although with God the question is, not the opinion of the priests, but the life of the accused," etc.

What our Conception of the Keys of the Church should be.

So vast is the extent of the Church now spread throughout the whole world, so great is the multitude of the faith-

ful, and such is the variety of their desires and wishes, that the industry of no one man, though he devote himself to it with all diligence and watchfulness, can exercise adequate care over all believers in matters which pertain to God. Indeed it is not possible to exercise such care over even a single individual. Not only are men changing in their relations to God every day, yes, every hour, but every moment they are either falling away from life in God or returning to it through the quickening power of the Holy Spirit diffusing love and grace in their hearts. But when they are thus being quickened anew, is there any key that opens the Church to them without the intervention of a minister except that key "which when it shuts, no man opens, and when it opens, no man shuts"? That key is the Holy Spirit, and the grace of God bestowed through it, and the love of God diffused in the hearts of those who have been quickened into life.

Here someone will say, "What then was conferred upon Peter by the statement of the Lord?" Two things, I say, were given to Peter. First, the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and these were given in like manner, although not equally, to all the sons of God who live through the quickening power of the Holy Spirit. By these keys the faithful admit every pious man and exclude every impious man, whatever his position or official rank. Second, Peter was given the duty of pastoral service. And in this, if he fulfills his office blamelessly, he will be regarded as worthy of double honor. Now this office is exercised only in matters that concern the mutual relations of baptized persons. For the pope received no pastoral commission from Christ in matters affecting the mutual relations of persons outside the Church. Nor did the pope receive a commission from Christ to deal with matters in which the individual does or does not do his duty toward God, but solely to deal with those matters in which the mutual fellowship

of the multitude of Christians is recognized by the prelates. For Christ did not command Peter to quicken the spiritually dead or to deprive living souls of life; that would be to give love to those who do not possess it or take it away from those possessing it.

In Promising the Keys Christ promised the Holy Spirit.

When the Lord Jesus promised Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven so that whatsoever he bound on earth would be bound in heaven, he promised nothing else than the Holy Spirit, and through the Holy Spirit the diffusion of love in the heart of Peter. For the promise that he made at that time he fulfilled after the resurrection, when he breathed on the apostles, saying: "Receive ye the Holy Spirit; whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." The Holy Spirit, being bestowed, produces such likeness to God in the hearts of the sons of God through grace, wisdom and love that they become truly godlike, yes gods, one in spirit with God. And those upon whom the Spirit thus works, so that in all their ways and doings they act purely, rightly and blamelessly, in their estimation of others judge wisely, justly, and in harmony with God. Therefore those in whom they delight and whom they accept as pleasing to God, those in whom they truly delight and whom they truly accept and judge to be pure, God also truly judges to be pure and receives with rejoicing. Nevertheless they themselves do not cleanse others from sin. Nor does God cleanse men because they judge them to be free from sin. But it is because God receives and cleanses men and forgives their sins that they who are guided by the Holy Spirit accept them, and lay aside that passionate zeal which they exercised against

them while they were yet sinners. Now therefore it is easy to see just what authority in matters sacramental and in the justification of the wicked a prelate possesses by virtue of his office. For in and because of the promise made to Peter, the pope possesses no more power than is allotted to him from his likeness to Peter. In so far as he is influenced in his actions by love and wisdom through the Holy Spirit, thus far does he hold the keys, but no further.

Moreover he who said, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind," etc., also said, "It is not for you to know times or seasons, which the Father hath set within his own authority." And since it was not for them to know these, it was not for them to be able to restore the kingdom of Israel; much less restore the kingdom of heaven, which was greater than the kingdom of Israel. In accordance with the word, "If ye cannot do that which is less, how can ye do that which is greater?" For God has reserved these things solely for his own power to accomplish.

Concerning the Power of the Pope and the Prelates in Excommunications and Indulgences.

Indulgences and excommunications are on the same plane with the authority or power of the keys. The pope has no more power in reconciling souls to God than in alienating them from him. Indeed in excommunicating he has no power except, through an ecclesiastical court, publicly to exclude a person from the privileges of the Church and to deprive even the bodies of the dead of ecclesiastical burial. Similarly, in indulgences he can only free a person from the bond of the canons and from censure. There is nothing whatever on account of which he can reconcile a soul to or alienate it from God except the simple use or abuse of faith, hope and love. For when one has been reconciled to God through sacramental grace

and love, he is not further reconciled through the judgment or opinion of the pope, nor does the pope's excommunication increase one's separation from God. For it would not be lawful to excommunicate, if it involved further separation from God. The pope cannot make men greater sinners than they already are, etc.

A faithful and wise servant in the household of his lord does nothing beyond or apart from his lord's will. And his lord ratifies and confirms whatever he does in the household. For being wise he knows every wish of his lord and being faithful he always follows it. Therefore whatever a wise and faithful servant wishes is desired and ratified by his lord. Hence whatever a faithful and wise servant desires, whatever he hates and detests, whatever he praises, approves, sanctions, and judges to be pure or polluted is confirmed and ratified in heaven. And for this he has authority, not through his position of rank, but through love diffused in his heart by the Holy Spirit. Hence it follows that the ratification of these desires, approvals and judgments does not spring from his authority, but from his conformity to a previously existing standard of right, which judges, looses, or binds before he does. So far as he conforms to that standard by his judgment, he shares in its authority and participates in the good work. For in binding or loosing, the judgment of the men thus binding or loosing does not precede, it follows God's judgment. And this is what was meant by the Lord Jesus when he said: "Receive ye the Holy Spirit: whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." As if he said more openly, "Whose soever sins ye retain or forgive through the Holy Spirit which ye have received, they are unquestionably retained or forgiven." But whoever is faithful and wise in the household of the Lord, having received the Holy Spirit, does not forgive or retain

sins unwisely or unfaithfully or in opposition to the Holy Spirit, nor does he make haste to judge before God does. Hence it follows that whatever he decides wisely and faithfully in accordance with God's judgment, he will find ratified in heaven. But the authority of a wise and faithful bishop, aside from his ministerial office, does not make for this more than does the burning love of any faithful, discreet and righteous man. Not even the female sex stands in the way of it; but anyone, who is faithful and wise and has love diffused in his heart, can of himself perceive, judge, sanction, determine in accordance with divine judgment. For these keys are the true keys of the kingdom of heaven, by which the kingdom of God is opened to all the children of God and by which they efficaciously open the door of the kingdom to others.

Concerning the Twofold Priesthood.

There is a double priesthood: the one due to rank, and so sacramental; the other inherent in our rational nature, and so common to all men. The second is sufficient without the first. The first without the second involves guilt. The second imparts grace. Through the second Anthony ranked above many bishops, and a tanner above Anthony.

The apostles were consecrated and anointed in the Holy Spirit. For the Holy Spirit himself is the ointment which Christ earned for us by his death. Therefore we have all been baptized and anointed in the death of Christ and in the Holy Spirit. It is clear therefore that Christ consecrated the apostles, and the disciples as well, because they all received the ointment of the Holy Spirit. Indeed no other oil or chrism was used by Christ in the consecration of his bishops and priests. But the Holy Church for the sake of reverence and dignity has instituted many things

which have secured veneration for the sacraments,—things which were not accustomed to be done in the primitive Church. The Apostle says, (Heb. x. 4), "It is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins." Yet he was not unaware that the ceremonials of the Law had been instituted by God, just as much as the sacraments of the new dispensation. Therefore in order to have any sacraments at all, it was necessary that the Son should come in order that he, being acceptable as a single sacrifice, might fulfil the purpose of God. So also with regard to the sacraments of the new Law. For it is just as impossible for God to take away sin by water or oil as by the blood of goats. And God is the author of both dispensations.

In absolution before a court of penance, special consideration must be given to the fact that it is not the priest that binds the chain by which the sinner is held. For it is sin alone that separates the sinner from God, because it is against God alone that he sins. And if he becomes reunited to Him, being loosed again from the bond of death, he is free to exercise love, honor and holy fear toward Him. In this freedom everyone can be revived in the name of Jesus, the name of the Trinity, and the name of the Lord, believing with piety, since "the name of the Lord is a strong tower." And he who believes in Jesus has eternal life, inasmuch as he so lives that he can make steady growth and progress, for faith imparts a true life.

Nevertheless by this I do not mean that confession ought not to be made when it can be done to advantage, i. e. so that those who are quickened and see may have a wider vision, and those who truly live may live more perfectly. For to those who receive the sacraments with piety, they are always efficacious for more grace, except when they become a hindrance to greater piety, as in the case of certain persons who lay such stress upon oral confession

that they hinder the more important matters of the Law, viz. love, the inner peace of the heart, and psalmody. For such persons they are not so much sacraments as hindrances, and therefore in certain places they should be omitted for the time being. If Paul, Anthony, Macarius, and Arsenius had not been of this opinion, they would not have remained hidden in solitary places, holding aloof from matters pertaining to the Church to the great loss of spiritual progress. There are bonds of wickedness and chains forged by unrighteous men which we are counseled to break. But no priest, not even the pope through his own power, can loose these unless the sinner himself is divinely aided to cast off the yoke which he like other wicked men has been carrying. The priest, however, can be a minister and preacher of the word, by giving heed to which one may be converted. The priest may desire and pray for his conversion, but he cannot convert him and thereby receive him into the communion of the righteous. God's purpose in giving the sacraments was not that they alone should be efficacious in converting an unrighteous man, but that they might aid one who has been converted. Hence—in due order—the sinner through love to God is first united to him, being restored to his place as a son of God; then he becomes a brother to the sons of God and is restored to communion with them. When therefore he is released from bondage, he is received in this brotherhood on equal terms by all the sons of God, whether he be Augustine in Spain or the pope in Italy. In this reception and fellowship, when he by divine grace becomes a son of God, all the brethren spread over him the mantle of charity.

The difficulty which many feel in this matter arises from intellectual confusion through the lack of discrimination. For if men exercised discrimination, surely they would not be thus tossed hither and thither and become uncertain and confused in their statements. Such confusion has

resulted in many evils among the people of God, such as ignorance, ambiguity, aimlessness, perplexity, error, inconsiderate haste, heresy, corruption of the flock, etc.

> "In Death there is no Remembrance of Thee; in Hell who shall confess to Thee?" (Ps. VI. 5.)

No one, however, confesses unless he remembers; no one remembers unless he has been justified unto life. No one lives while he remains the son of hell. It is clear, therefore, that before anyone confesses his sin, through the grace of inward compunction, he is already absolved from the guilt of the transgression for which he deserved everlasting punishment. Augustine in his *De Pœnitent. ca. Si cui* argues as follows: "If, therefore, before anyone confesses, he is restored to life, he is alive while he confesses; just as he could not make confession before being restored from the dead, so a dead man cannot confess unless after revival. It follows, therefore, that, being revived, he must be alive while he is confessing his sin." Unquestionably he has his Restorer present with him, dwelling within him. For, as Augustine continues in the same passage: "Just as the body cannot live without the soul, so the soul cannot live unless God be present, dwelling within it and quickening it." And so the soul that, while living, confesses its sin, has God present with it through grace; and God, who is life, already dwells in the soul, which he thus causes to live. If, however, he is dwelling in it, the soul, having already become the temple of the Holy Spirit, is illuminated. Therefore it is freed from the darkness of sin; it has ceased to be the temple of the devil, since it has returned to the light through which the darkness is put to flight. For as the Apostle testifies: "Christ hath no concord with Belial." "Or what agreement hath a temple of

God with idols?" Hence every man is a temple of God, whose sacrifice of praise honors God.

How shall souls that are dead praise thee, O Lord? Indeed, all who praise God have more life than those who merely confess to God the sins they have committed against him. For it is more important to delight in the Lord than to detest one's sins. But he that loves God much, lives with even more life than he that honors God with the sacrifice of praise. Therefore true atonement is nothing else than perfect life in God. For the more imperfect the life one lives, the farther he is separated from life; and the more he lives, the greater the life he has dwelling within him. For everyone that hates evil comes unto the light. But the proofs of this hatred are confession, detestation, rendering satisfaction. To love the light is greater than to hate the darkness. But whoever praises the light, already loves it; and he that esteems it much, loves it more. From such persons it is necessary not to exact proofs of their hatred of sin, but to encourage and advance them in the life they have begun.

For they ought not to be called back from a higher to a lower life. Thus I think it would be a mistake to wish to recall Magdalene from her freedom from work to the ministry of alms in order to make atonement for her sins. And a little beyond the above passage Augustine expressly adds: "Since therefore, as has been proved, we are justified through grace and become the sons of light before we confess, it is perfectly clear that sin is forgiven solely because of the heart's contrition, and not because of oral confession." And again a little below: "Hence sin is not forgiven in confession, because, as has been proved, it has already been forgiven. And so confession is made in order to manifest one's repentance, not to obtain forgiveness. Just as circumcision of the foreskin was given to Abraham as a sign of righteousness, not as the means of his justi-

fication, so confession is offered to the priest as a sign of forgiveness that has been received, and not for the purpose of receiving forgiveness."

Our Faith is due, not to Man, but to God.

Belief in the Lord God, the Father, is *latria*. Hence, while the Church believes, it does not believe in any member of the Church. For it believes in God; and in so believing, believes in Jesus Christ, who is God; it also believes in the Holy Spirit speaking through the apostles, evangelists and prophets. Rightly therefore does Paul admonish Christians not to believe anyone coming to them with any gospel other than that which they had received from him; they were not to believe even the Apostle himself, if he came preaching anything else than that which the Holy Spirit had preached before through him. For the Church believes neither in Peter nor Paul, nor in an angel from heaven; neither in any part of the Church nor in the whole Church; but in God alone, in whom it also hopes, and whom it worships by thus believing and hoping. Nevertheless if anyone—even though the Holy Spirit does not speak through him—cites the words of the apostles, evangelists or prophets, he most firmly believes in the true doctrines of our faith as they have been handed down to us by the Holy Spirit speaking through others. Therefore, although the Holy Spirit does not speak in such persons, yet they speak in the Holy Spirit; as the Apostle says elsewhere, "No man can say Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit." Words such that no one can say them without speaking in the Spirit of God, i. e. without repeating utterances made by the Spirit of God at some time, which have received the strength of authority,—all such words, by whomsoever spoken, must be firmly believed, not because of him who utters them, but because he utters them, speak-

ing in the Spirit of God. Now this clearly shows what sort of faith must be put in the preachers of the Church, in the highest pontiffs, and in General Councils. For faith must always be put in those who speak in the Spirit of God, i. e. speak things which the Spirit of God has spoken, and because he has spoken. For we believe in God, not in the Catholic Church, not in the Latin Council, not in the pope.

Still it is not probable that the host of the faithful or the assembly of faithful Latins is so wholly forsaken by God as to be delivered over and abandoned to corrupt pastors. Yet perhaps for very deep and hidden reasons, when love grows cold and in perilous times, God may allow some other power to control his Church and give his people pastors of error. For even General Councils, as well as the highest Roman pontiffs, have issued plenary indulgences. I say "it is not probable," because it is not necessarily so. I speak particularly of the "faithful Latins," because there are the faithful of so many tongues beyond the sources of the Nile, beyond the Indus, the Hydaspis, and the Ganges, who cannot be reached by Latin decrees. I say "for very deep reasons," because of the most just and hidden predestination. I say "in perilous times, on account of abounding iniquity and love growing cold," because at such times there will arise self-seeking men, despisers of God, blasphemers, scoffers, men who think piety is gain.

The common belief in the absolute rule of the Roman pontiff is untenable in view of the fact that it is impossible for a man to know the territory of the whole earth, which has never been entirely included in the works of any cosmographer. For how shall he judge those whom he cannot know? How shall he judge of the faith of men whose language he is not acquainted with? Hence we reach the conclusion that the Holy Spirit has kept for himself the task of encouraging, quickening, preserving and increasing

the unity of the Church; he has not left it to a Roman pontiff who often pays no attention to it.

We ought to acknowledge one Catholic Church, and yet to acknowledge its unity as the unity of the faith and of the Head, the unity of the corner stone, not as the unity of its director, Peter, or his successor. For what could Peter in Italy do for those in India endangered by temptation or persecution but pray for them, even though he had greater power than his successors? Or what could be done during the fiercest persecutions against the teachers of error in different parts of the world? What decrees or General Councils were able to hold the Church together even in external unity? Hence it is only the internal unity of its one essential Head that is implied in the words of the Apostles' Creed. For to-day, in accordance with the very word of the Lord, the testimony of the gospel has been received even at the ends of the earth, and Christians are actually found beyond the Hyperboreans, beyond the Indians and Scythians, beyond the Ethiopians, beyond the Tropic of Capricorn. To these Christians, widely separated in land and tongue, no decrees of a Roman pontiff or of our General Councils of Constance or Basel can be known by any human means. And nevertheless they together with us constitute one Catholic and Apostolic Church in the oneness of faith, piety and true love, even if they do not know that there is a Rome or that there is a Roman pontiff.

God has not bound men together in fellowship with the bond of faith in order that one may necessarily believe that what the other asserts is true. But he has bound them together in love in order that one may be obligated to love the other, even though a sinner. One is not bound to believe a person even when he is speaking the truth. Indeed I may have good reason for being cautious about believing a loving friend, even when he is speaking the

truth. And this is because none of us can know another's mind any more than if we were all dumb, deaf and blind to one another. Not that we do not perceive much through the senses, but that we do not know each other's inmost thoughts. Since, therefore, we are not bound to believe any man, we are not bound to believe the pope. For our faith would be driven to and fro in great uncertainty, if we were bound to believe one who is often in error himself. This can be proved in and through the Decretals; and Rabineus at Angers while arguing publicly *in cathedra* with me admitted it saying, "If these things are so, our entire foundation is false." If therefore one is not bound to believe canons that have been officially published and authoritatively ratified, because they are outside of the Sacred Canon, one is not bound to believe any pope. But one should love, revere and obey him, only in so far as he fulfills his office rightly.

Every man in his individual capacity ought to assume that no assembly of distinguished men will err in its decisions. And it is reasonable and respectful to assume this, not only of an assembly of distinguished men, but even of any famous man. Yet one is not bound by this assumption to reach a hasty conclusion or to decide that whatever that assembly may determine is on that account true. For whenever a man who has put his faith in God in accordance with Sacred Scripture deems some statement to be contrary to Sacred Scripture, he ought first of all to suspect that the Scriptures are not comprehended aright. And so he ought to search carefully not only the reasoning and discernment of those who put forth such a statement, but also the meaning and true understanding of the Scripture with which the statement seems to conflict. But he ought never to subscribe to any statement of an assembly against his conscience, so long as it seems to him to assert anything contrary to Scripture. And

yet he should always show that he is ready to believe when he is better informed. For it is with good reason that a statute in councils provides that even if there be but one person who wishes to dispute a decree, he must be heard.

Inasmuch as all the Law and the Prophets hang on love, the exercise of love will be more useful than zeal for the truth, not only for the recompense resulting from it, but for the advancement of knowledge. For the object of reading the Scripture is that God may be loved. And although loving God results in making the Scriptures become plain and clear, yet it is not because of this result that God is most loved.

The carnal minded man does not understand the workings of holy love. Therefore he is not qualified to act as a judge in such matters. Hence it is clear that the judgment of the Church and the excommunications and indulgences of those who govern in the Church (inasmuch as such persons are often carnal, bestial, worldly, or devilish, and yet truly administer their office as though they were spiritual men filled with God) do not concern those matters which pertain to charity and love, but only to the external peace and tranquillity of the Church. Hence indulgences are only remissions from those punishments which a prelate has enjoined or can enjoin. Excommunications are exclusions from social intercourse and communion. For no one, but God alone, can exclude a person from spiritual participation with those who fear and love God.

Errors may arise in the Church of God through the rashness or ignorance or negligence or malice of prelates in enacting laws, in dispensing favors, in obtaining profit from their enactments, in fulminating censures, in granting indulgences, and in disturbing, dominating, or excommunicating the people of God; but nothing in all this offends the true lover of God as much as the open persecution of

the unbelieving. For him truly "to die is gain." For the love of God is so free that it is not subject to human laws, nor even to the Prophets; nor to the Law of Moses, when it was still in force. Not everyone ought to be allowed to choose for himself. For he who without love lays claim to the liberty of love, roams about loose and unbridled and rushes headlong into every evil.

Knowledge is the interpreter of truth; wisdom is concerned with our welfare. Hence knowledge may be useless and vain. Such is all knowledge which follows truth out of curiosity. Just as the garrulousness of women is foolish because it seeks satisfaction in mere talk. So knowledge seeks merely the truth. But wisdom seeks the benefit arising from the truth. Hence it follows that, inasmuch as many truths contribute but little to man's benefit, the truly wise man pays but little attention to these. And so, rightly, wisdom is not curious. Puppies are benefited by all their running, leaping, struggling, being conquered and in turn conquering, tearing and leaping upon each other; when however they have become dogs, ripe for the hunt, they no longer rush foolishly at one another, but, laying aside their play, hunt the game in all seriousness. Thus it is with jesting and seriousness, sport and earnestness, curiosity and wisdom. There is activity in the former, but benefit in the latter. So knowledge and wisdom are far apart. To such as play with each other, activity itself is the goal. But for those who do business in earnest, benefit arising from activity is the aim.

All men by nature have a desire for knowledge; for it is the natural activity of the central division of the mind. And inasmuch as the memory and the will are parts of man, who is the likeness of God, no less than knowledge, all men naturally desire to remember as well as to know. Now it is because we wish to remember in order to know, that we seem to desire to know rather than to remember.

If, however, we follow up this rule of philosophy, we find that even knowledge itself is not our ultimate goal. For he who knows solely for the sake of knowledge is foolish, because he neither appreciates the benefits of knowledge nor disposes his knowledge wisely. Recognition of the truth is in itself very beneficial, if it is in the hands of a wise husbandman. For through it, he who acquires this knowledge may draw near to God so as to become his friend. And if in becoming acquainted with God he clings to him, he will gradually make progress until he tastes how sweet the Lord is. And in tasting he will eagerly desire him, and in eagerly desiring him, he will fervently long for him, and in this burning desire he will love and live in God, so that he will become one spirit with God. This is the true, pure, sound fruit of sound knowledge. Indeed all men naturally desire to possess this union with God more than to remember or to know. For just as wavering meditation is foolish apart from knowledge, so knowledge is barren apart from love. Nay more, our desire for memory and knowledge springs from this source of all our desires. For we see and are certain that nothing is loved by all men more than happiness. Moreover we know that nothing is so lovable as love. Further we know that nothing ought to be loved as much as God. If these three statements are true, nay rather because they are altogether true and certain and every truth is in accord with truth, it must follow that to us our God is blessed love and that we by nature strive eagerly after him alone. For this is the end and goal of our perfection, the true and only fruit of our culture, and he who does not attain it is a foolish husbandman. He who remembers in order to remember is foolish, because he forgets his knowledge. Much wiser is he who remembers in order to know. But if he stops with that, he too is foolish, because he remains useless and vain, barren of his proper fruit. For what if a tree

with a strong root, a solid trunk, and tall branches covered with leaves, lifts itself high in the air,—what if, with this great promise of much fruit, it should disappoint the waiting husbandman with a false and lying hope? So philosophers grow in height, beholding the invisible things of God through what he has done. But because they regard the knowledge of God as their goal and fruit, they are rejected as barren and dry. Foolish indeed is the heart of those who do not know, in order that they may love.

But why do they not love him when they know him and are acquainted with him, unless it is because they know him in order to know, but not in order to judge of his worth? And so, although they know him, they do not value him. How then can they love him, so long as in their perversity they do not value him? Hence we find that these senseless men, in spite of two most powerful natural desires, cease making progress in the midst of life, finding a goal where none exists. And since we have decided that God is the chief goal of this life, when they decide upon something else as their fruit and goal (though men may pass milder judgment upon them), they are idolaters. For those who know in order to know, even though they know God himself, exalt their knowledge above God; because if they exalted the knowledge of God above their own knowledge, they would glorify God above all things.

But there is a third class who know in order to be known. These are foolish, being guilty of a baser folly, since they have made other men's opinion of themselves their god, —truly an unstable and faithless god, but a god their own folly has fashioned for them. They are but little better than those of the fourth grade, since they are men who wish to know in order to be highly esteemed. These have descended into the depths of the lake, men to whom the extent of their knowledge is their god. And these are

not only foolish as are the other classes, but what is more intolerable, they are also harmful, seditious and unendurable to their associates. For those who wish to be greatly esteemed wish the mass of men to be insignificant and the common people to be weak in comparison with themselves. Such men regard the infirmity of others as their god.

But the fourth and last grade consists of those who wish to appear to be the only ones who know. These—not in the lake, but at its bottom, in the lowest place—are associates of him who is king over all the sons of pride, who esteems nothing but himself, and dwells in solitude. They partake of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil and eat of its fruit; knowing forsooth that they may know! And for this they shall sometime discover themselves to be naked. Indeed those who eat of this fruit that they may become as gods, i. e. that they may be regarded—as gods are—superior to all others,—these on account of their unseemly arrogance are very often stripped of all honor and distinction so that they are indeed compelled of themselves to blush and fall from peace of heart, finding themselves so disturbed, angered and indignant at being driven as it were out of paradise that, seeing their ambition in every direction shattered, they come to regard all things as barren, dry, rough, hard and frightful.

"This is not a wisdom that descendeth from above, but is animal, earthly, devilish. But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, judging without hypocrisy." The animal wisdom here alluded to is ascribed, not to the animal, but to the soul, although in a connected sentence it amounts to the same thing as if it were ascribed to the animal. For the sentence is usually read in connection with the idea that the soul gives life to the flesh; and hence from mere habit and custom this wisdom has been more often regarded as "animal" (as though

belonging to animals) than as "rational." But since the Apostle James (III. 15) said, not ζωικὴ but ψυχικὴ, thereby designating and distinguishing this wisdom as a wisdom that is not derived from the animal, he is evidently condemning a certain higher wisdom, viz. that wisdom which springs from the rational soul as its particular source. Obviously this wisdom, which has its source and origin in ourselves, does not descend to us from above. Hence all the curiosity of the philosophers, which grew from other seeds than those of piety, was animal. This was what caused them to be absorbed in their own reflections, so that they became bestial and earthly, and God delivered them over to their evil inclinations. Thus their bodies, which through piety should have been the temples for God's indwelling became subject to disgraceful passions. Nor did their ruin end with this; but from being earthly they became devilish under the secret persuasion and enticement of demons; and saw to it that statues, altars, incense, temples, and festal days, religious rites, titles and inscriptions bearing their names were made in their own honor. This did Pythagoras, Socrates, and Plato, but especially Aristotle. They set out for Egypt and Persia for no other purpose than that through conversation and intimacy with demons they might become famous and disseminate their devilish curiosity.

But spiritual wisdom is that which is taught and breathed into man by the spirit of wisdom, which James says descends from above because it has sprung from above, from the Holy Spirit. For as the Holy Spirit is higher than the soul, and our soul however much it may quicken the body is dead without it, it follows that that which quickens the soul is itself a spirit quickening our soul and mind, our virtues and our holy deeds. And this spirit is God. And those who worship him, should worship him as a spirit. "It is the spirit that giveth life; the flesh profiteth noth-

ing." Many questions are here involved as to mental images and conceptions, pertaining both to the senses and the intellect; as to reflections of acts and intentions and the first conception of acts, and whether the animal or the spiritual is concerned in these.

A Definition of Backbiting; Reporting the Crimes of Others is not Backbiting.

Backbiting a neighbor is not permissible, because backbiters are "hateful to God." But censuring the crimes of wicked neighbors is permissible, because it is in accordance with the Lord's example in upbraiding the scribes and Pharisees for their avarice and arrogance. It is also in accordance with the example of both the righteous and the blessed, as well as of Sacred Scripture in recounting and dealing plainly with the sins of David and the sons of Zebedee. Therefore, reporting the sins of neighbors is not backbiting, not even if it be done with the intention of defaming them. Thus the Apostle recounts the sins of false apostles in order to render them infamous and unworthy of authority with their hearers. It is harmful for honest men to have a good opinion of a corrupt man. To give honor to a fool is as bad as to put a sword into the hands of a mad man; to give authority to the worthless is worse; but to bestow dignity upon the malicious is worst of all. In all such cases we violate the Lord's command forbidding us to bear false witness. He that honors an unworthy or foolish man in word or deed, thereby bears false witness. Besides it is contrary to the word, "Judge uprightly, ye sons of men." For every act by which a worthless man is judged worthy of authority, or a foolish man of honor, is unjust. Hence backbiting, to become an offense, must include more than the mere purpose of recounting the wicked deeds of others; e. g. it must recount

them, not from hatred of sin, but from hatred of a person. For if a backbiter could not bring true charges, he would make some sort of false and lying insinuations. But he that hates a sinner because of his hatred of sin and hence censures and defames him, hates him with perfect hatred, as does the Psalmist.

Those who report the wicked deeds of others do not incur the sin of backbiting, unless they speak with positive malice and tell absolute falsehoods. For they do not report them in order falsely to overthrow innocence. Hence even if they speak from the mere love of talking and yet think they are telling the truth, I do not regard them as backbiters. For the malice and wickedness of hypocrites is so great that it is wise to have it published and spread abroad. Hence he who makes a matter known in order to render his hearers more cautious, has performed a duty of brotherly love. For example the Apostle warns his hearers "to mark them that walk not so"; the Lord Jesus cautions his disciples "to beware of false prophets," etc., and elsewhere, "to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy," adding "by their fruits ye shall know them." But how will they "beware of" or "mark" persons regarding whom they assume no evil? How will they assume it of persons concerning whom they have heard nothing? And how will they hear unless someone reports? And how will there be any report, if it be not permitted? Hence, one not only may, one ought to report other persons' disgraceful and wicked deeds and crimes, though not from any desire to backbite or to diminish their good reputation. A reputation is good, when it is not false, when its owner, through others' faith in his character, does not secure impunity and license to sin and opportunity to corrupt. But if one's reputation is not true, how is it good? If I detract from a reputation that is false, licentious, unpunished, harmful, it is not the act of

a slanderer, but of one who admonishes and warns his neighbor to avoid imminent danger. And all the more when greater danger impends as a result of silence. Such are the crimes of corrupt clergy and prelates, who ought especially to be restrained by the highest criminal courts. What if one were not permitted to report these, etc?

Love ought to oppose Bad Men and Hypocrites; Defaming Such Men is not Backbiting.

Love esteems a man on account of his goodness; and the same love hates him on account of his wickedness. For the Psalmist says, "Am not I grieved with those that rise up against thee? I hate them with perfect hatred." A man of charity is worthy of love; but a man of iniquity is worthy of hatred. If there is both physical and spiritual weakness in a man, and you see that the spiritual is weaker than the physical, you should—out of love—disregard the physical and not cure it, even if you could do so with a little medicine. Just so with poverty. For every outward kindness ought to be done with a view to restoring the inner man. Now just as you should act with reference to a man's outward good and physical health, so should you act with regard to his name and reputation. No favor should be extended to the name or fame or reputation of those who use their reputation, as sheep's clothing, the more freely to attack and corrupt their flock. Indeed to oppose such men is to exercise the love of God. And they are not opposed as long as they are allowed to disguise themselves. Therefore the wickedness of such men ought to be made known and published abroad. And defaming them is not backbiting. For to backbite is to disparage a good man and a holy name with evil intent. But to detract from a false and harmful name in order that the fox and the wolf may be truly recognized as such

in my opinion does not detract from the wolf or the fox, although something may have been taken from his crafty schemes. But to disclose the plots of wolves I do not think ought to be regarded as backbiting, unless perchance to resist the devil is backbiting, etc.

He that sitteth in the Seat of the Scornful.

All lofty profession accompanied by coldness of heart is a curse in the Church of God. Therefore he that assumes leadership, directorship, preeminence, dignity, sanctity, a doctorate, a priesthood, or a pontificate, and still looks longingly upon riches, luxuries, honors, or ambition, he sitteth in the seat of the scornful, etc.

Doctor Wessel's Judgment of the Studies in Universities.

There is a strong and weighty argument against universities to be drawn from the fact that Paul secured but little fruit at Athens, accomplishing more in the neighboring city of Corinth and in Thessaly, which was then almost barbarous, than in the Attic city, at that time the fountain of Greek philosophy. It goes to show that liberal studies are not very pleasing to God. In fact what I saw when I lived in Cologne and Paris is certainly hateful to God,—not the study of sacred literature, but the moral corruption existing in the midst of such studies.

"Many publicans and sinners sat down with Jesus; for there were many, and they followed him." This word points to the great corruption of the Pharisees and scribes of that time. For although from childhood they had received holy training in the Law, they practiced it for gain rather than for piety, and they neither heeded nor followed piety, even when it displayed itself incarnate.

Instead they scoffed, they mocked, they persecuted. But the publicans, though trained in and corrupted by habits of vice and concubinage, sinners indeed outwardly, but within less corrupt and less harmful than the Pharisees and scribes, not only did not despise, but eagerly received the truth.

To-day, we have good reason to fear that there is a still worse plague in the corruption of our preachers and pastors. Publicans and harlots will be converted to righteousness more easily in the great day of the Lord than men of this sort, who know the will of God and yet scoff at it. For although they handle the word of God every day, they do not obey it, and their souls are hardened in following their stony paths and become corrupt. Nay they grow more and more hardened, they are converted with greater difficulty than publicans and harlots, they more wickedly oppose sound doctrine; hence their conversion becomes more hopeless. "For many publicans and sinners sat down with Jesus and followed him." Hence even the publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of God before the Pharisees and scribes. Even as the fire that burns in water is strong, so is the stubborn wickedness that persists and remains fixed in spite of the daily handling of God's word. For those who know God and yet despise him are necessarily handed over to their evil inclinations so that they become the vilest of all men. Better for such men not to have known the way of truth, for they will receive the heavier judgment, etc.

Here follow Several Notes on the Sacrament of Consoling Penance, in which those who assume Three Essential Parts to the Sacrament are rebuked.

It is generally said that three things contribute to the completeness of the sacrament of penance, viz. contrition,

confession, and satisfaction. But this would not be so fiercely maintained if there were a proper understanding of the force of the words uttered in the Psalm, "A broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." What is a contrite heart but a hard heart broken and crumbled into pieces, the humbled heart of a stubborn soul? Contrition is nothing but crumbled stubbornness, broken up until it yields to God. Therefore to have one's heart crumbled is to cast aside one's hard heart, to offer a willing heart to God,—compare the word, "I will freely sacrifice unto thee." To turn aside from evil is nothing less than doing good, since he that does not do good, has not yet turned aside from evil. For not to do good is evil. If therefore one who breaks his hard heart and casts it aside offers God a loyal and willing heart which he will not despise, surely, since his heart has been humbled, he is already justified, he has already rendered satisfaction to God and received the forgiveness of his sins. Hence neither contrition, as a first essential, nor satisfaction, as a last, is necessary for the justification and quickening of a sinner from death unto life through the sacrament of penance, although the life of the spirit is neither restored nor maintained without true contrition, etc. as well as humility.

Participation in the sacraments is a work of grace, not of righteousness. The Realists place righteousness before the sacrament of confession rather than after it, because true contrition precedes it, and only penal satisfaction follows it.

If penance is a sacrament, it does not need contrition. For contrition is a work of righteousness. And so a contrite man is righteous before the sacrament. Therefore the sacrament of justification is not the return to life. And yet I do not on this account hold that a confessant cannot come in contrition to the sacrament, just as one

who has already been baptized in the Holy Spirit can come to be baptized.

Contrition is the work of true righteousness, and from its very nature it follows the sacrament in point of time, unless God anticipates the sacrament and receives the penitent beforehand for his justification. Justification presupposes grace and wisdom; contrition, righteousness and love. Love, being already bestowed, demands purification, not on account of past sins, but simply because of existing imperfection and impurity; for love covers our past transgressions. Otherwise Magdalene and Peter would have needed long cleansing, as would any penitent.

Contrition is the work of grace that has already been bestowed, while evidently detestation of sin is the work of true righteousness. Contrition is not, therefore, a part of the sacrament of penance. For it precedes the sacrament of penance and brings about justification. Indeed contrition is nothing else than a right estimation of one's sins, such as Magdalene might have had in the midst of her joy on Easter day, or Peter, when the Lord Jesus appeared to him. At that time neither of them had any perceptible grief of heart.

Hence those who exact righteousness from the approaching sinner before the sacrament of grace, not only detract much from the generosity of the giver but also lay a heavy burden upon the shoulders of the sinner. I call contrition righteousness. For he that is contrite is already righteous; he is not quickened into life by the sacrament, but is merely released from any obligation to confess before the Church. Concerning confession, see what is written above and below in regard to the power of binding and loosing.

Further, with reference to this point, it is especially to be noted that neither grief nor sadness nor contrition is more acceptable in God's sight than the love from which they proceed. For love is the first of all the passions.

Even Judas grieved and was so sad that he went and hanged himself. But his grief was not acceptable because it proceeded out of love for himself, not for God. This is perfectly evident from its source, which was perverted judgment and folly, leading and directing him to a foolish end.

Inasmuch as all fear, mourning, hope and grief grow out of love as their root, it must be admitted that a penitent man's grief for sin wins no more favor in God's sight than the love from which it proceeds. Hence, when Judas was penitent for having betrayed innocent blood, his grief did not please God any more than the love out of which it proceeded. For he so loved himself that he became a thief, wishing to satisfy his desire to steal from a purse which he kept concealed. Yet in daily intercourse and conversation with the apostles he had handled the truths of the divine law and from what he had seen he could no more doubt that Christ was the God of life than could the demons. And when he had carefully compared the advantages of money and the dangers of divine judgment, it was the same love for himself that compelled him to regard the advantages of money as mere dung, seeing the terror of divine judgment threatening him. Hence his grief was no more pleasing to God than the root of it in Judas' heart, viz. his love of himself. And on this account in spite of his desire to live on in wickedness he saw that this because of his own acts was impossible; and therefore in foolish grief he went and hanged himself—false at the root, falser at the branch, falsest in the fruit he bore. Hence those who try so hard to extort grief from the penitent, display little wisdom. For they ought rather to arouse his joy. Very much to the point is the parable of the lost silver or treasure, at whose loss a wise person grieves only in proportion to his love for it. But this grief lasts only so long as the silver is lost. Indeed, when the

treasure is found, there is no longer any grief, no longer need of even wise grief. But rather from overflowing joy one calls his neighbors and friends together to rejoice with him. Hence the fruit meet for repentance is neither grief nor sadness over sin; but rather the love of God, out of which grief may proceed, although love springs more strongly and joy more readily from reconciliation with God. No one doubts that Magdalene truly bore fruit meet for repentance. But what fruit? Unless it was that she loved much and out of her deep love there followed many tears and self-forgetting sadness, grieving that she had had no part in the great boon of holy love. Therefore her grief was proportioned to her love of this blessed love. Yet much greater, incomparably greater was her joy at seeing that love in her heart; but still greater in finding her God through love. Hence in proportion as it is more important to have God reconciled to us and to have the love of God that will abide in us forever, ought we the more to rejoice rather than to grieve even though we have been alienated from God for a considerable time, etc. Indeed neither grief nor mourning nor visible sadness is necessarily required for repentance. For repentance, as well as sin, is an act of the mind, both being an act of the will. Like sin repentance is merely an act of the will alone. However the fruit meet for repentance is complete conversion to Him from whom one has turned away and thus sinned. And he that can show this fruit is most truly repentant, because the repentance that seeks such fruit is good. Hence Magdalene was more repentant—more fruitfully repentant—when she loved much than when she detested her former life. At this point, however, I may say that I do not think that torture of the flesh—if it be very wisely and sensibly enjoined upon the penitent—is to be censured.

In Magdalene the fruit meet for repentance commends

not her bitter sorrow, but her love. This is suggested by Paul when he directs the Corinthians to confirm their love toward the man who had dishonored his own stepmother by marriage, and especially when he added as a reason for so doing, "lest he should be swallowed up with his overmuch sorrow." Now if Paul emphasized love and wished such a man to be comforted and encouraged by love and not to be swallowed up with his overmuch sorrow, it follows that God is pleased only with that sorrow which proceeds from love of the Lord whom one has offended, and not with that which is begotten out of the disgrace of sin, such as Judas had, and Cain before him. After the betrayal, Judas, reviewing what he had done, was overwhelmed with unendurable bitterness. Then led by penitence, he brought back the silver pieces, and casting them down in the temple, publicly confessed that he had sinned in that he had betrayed innocent blood. And not content with the confession he went away and hanged himself. Now in this we should mark, not the sorrow, but the frenzy of his tortured soul, like the frenzy of the legions of demons who were suffered to go into the herd of swine, and then drove them violently down a steep place into the sea. In like manner Judas, when the enormity of the crime he had perpetrated began to be clear in his heart, became unendurable to himself. And because stubborn pride spurns God and cannot think of him in humility or piety or faith, he could not endure the goads of truth, and had recourse to hanging. Therefore the realization of the grievousness of one's sins, even if it brings great sorrow, brings but little salvation. But the fervor of love, proceeding out of a true recognition of one's sins, bears much fruit of salvation. For those bitter tears of Peter's were not barren but were the results of his love of the Lord Jesus, a love surpassing the love of the other apostles. We have been called to love,—not

to feel bitter grief. God is well pleased with love, not sorrow.

Hence if a person grieves because of love, God is pleased, —not that he grieves, but that he grieves because of love. This is clear from the word of the Lord Jesus to Magdalene (who loved him much), when he bade her lay aside her grief, saying, "Go in peace." Commending her love, he urged her to cultivate it. Some persons however in their ignorance of this path of light and true wisdom can hardly endure to see Judas grieving so bitterly and to read the Lord Jesus' stern judgment of him. But they are greatly mistaken in thinking that the sorrow which arises from the enormity of one's sins is pleasing to God. Such sorrow is as little pleasing to him as the cruelty, fierceness, ferocity and frenzy of murderers. For these, the last ointments of their own wickedness, stubbornness, malice, pride, contumely and blasphemy, do accompany and trouble criminals, though destitute of any feeling of love, when the clear ray of truth illumines the region of death. For what is more loathsome to see or more dreadful to look upon than the realm of the king of pride? etc. In this kingdom death holds rule; here all desire death, and each one with loud prayers hopes for death from his neighbor. How different is this from the region of the living, where lies the kingdom of perfect love and honor!

I have asserted that the fruit meet for repentance does not involve intervening grief for past sin and confusion and confession, in order that one may be justified and begin to live again. And this seems to be fully supported by Christ's parable of the two sons, of whom the first-born, although he at first refused to go into his father's vineyard, afterwards went, and because he did so, is said to have done the will of his father. I ask: In what did he do his father's will? In that he could, or that he did, go into the vineyard? If he had not gone, however much he might have repented

his failure to do so, he would have constantly increased his first act of disrespect. Therefore, in respecting his father and doing his will, he repented; but he did not do his will by repenting. So also the publicans and harlots did God's will in believing John the Baptist and cleaving to him in the way of righteousness, by which he had come to them. Yet their penitence was accepted on account of the way of righteousness, but the way of righteousness was not accepted on account of their penitence. So also the penitent Magdalene was forgiven many sins because she loved much, and her penitence was accepted on account of her love, not her love on account of her penitence. No hatred is to be approved except that which proceeds out of love. And if love be perfect, there is no need of its being fostered and increased through hatred. It is sufficient for Magdalene's love that, returning to the way of righteousness, she should regard her sins as though she were already rejoicing in heaven; just as she—in the way of righteousness—should have regarded the sins of others, merely hating and rebuking them; and just as she ought to have regarded other sins which she herself had not committed.

A priest no more judges or absolves in the sacrament of confession than he purifies in baptism. For while the priest touches one with water outwardly, it is only Christ that baptizes in the Holy Spirit. The same is true of the other sacraments. The priest indeed does perform a visible ministry, but he does not exercise the right of any authority. For spiritual life, which is granted through the grace of the Holy Spirit, is granted by no one but Christ. Hence the benefit of sacramental absolution in confession does not depend upon the judicial authority of the confessor. Otherwise, whenever anyone in pious simplicity and sincere godliness without any contempt for the authority of the Church confessed to another person, he could not obtain absolution; for it could not be granted by one who

did not possess the priest's right to judge him. It is not the priest that looses the bonds of sin, but Christ. Just as it is not the presbyter that baptizes in the Holy Spirit, but Christ. For it is the baptism of Christ; not of John, nor of Peter, nor Paul, nor Apollos.

A Comforting Discussion of the Point that Sacramental Confession is not Judicial; and that the Confessant ought to be absolved without Judicial Examination.

Sacramental confession, in respect to its form, is not judicial. For to be judicial there must be a sentence, and that severe, on the part of the confessor; otherwise the act of the confessant and the absolver does not really constitute a true sacrament. To establish the real efficacy of the sacrament, it is sufficient that the confessant should speak in truth and good faith; and that the confessor, after receiving the confession, should absolve the confessant without judicial examination. For, just as in the confession, it is God—and not the sinner—that cleanses the penitent, so in the priest's absolution, it is God and not the confessor that forgives. The priest performs his ministry, but God works the mystery. When God within the sinner does not judge his sins, why is there any necessity of an outward, visible sentence upon sin? For thereby something is superfluously required in the sacrament, which has no concern with the hidden mystery. God judges only the confessant and the confession, he does not judge the sins that have been confessed. For how is he supposed to judge already confessed sins, when he has promised the confessant that he will pardon all his past sins simply because of his confession? They therefore do foolishly, who not only judge confessants after their confession, but even after absolving them, torture them, lash them with whips and strike them with rods. God does

not judge fasting and hair-shirts, though man assumes such judgment. God regards the penitent, not his sins; so the man who cannot regard the penitent but wishes to regard his past sins, acts contrary to God. A priest cannot judge whether a confessant confesses truly, faithfully. But if he does confess truly and faithfully, God does not wish to judge him for his sins at all. As for God's judgment after confession, that concerns the confessant's remaining uncleanness, much of which often arises from weakness, from former evil habits, from manifold associations, from force of circumstances aided by vanity, from secret sins and inconsistencies,—defects which God alone can pardon in a righteous man, in the appointed haven of his salvation and grace. Therefore priests would make for a better example of life by correcting their confessants' morals than by terrifying them with blows and lashes. For they do violence both to the liberty of the confessant and to the graciousness of a forgiving God, belittling God's gift and discouraging a scrupulous confession on the part of the confessant. This gives rise to a false implication in regard to both: God is blamed for not granting his forgiveness generously and completely; and the confessant is deterred from full confession by the terror of being punished, etc. (For further discussion of confession see above.)

Men speak most irrationally in regard to the sacrament of confession, when they assert that satisfaction—which they add to it—constitutes an essential part of penance. First, because they detract from its sacramental sufficiency in thinking that God's princely gift does not suffice for forgiveness. Second, because they give a false signification to the word of absolution, in that they say "I absolve," and afterwards bind the confessant and send him away with a noose tied about his neck. But, worst of all, they endanger the whole sacrament because they withhold its efficacy until the enjoined penance has been fully paid.

Hence if a weak confessant falls again during the intervening time while the sacrament is still in process, he sets up an obstacle in an essential part of the sacrament and thereby nullifies the whole of it. For all the essential parts that constitute a unit are nullified, if the one part is nullified. Let them therefore consider what "a snare they are casting" upon the faithful in saying that a sacrament is essentially protracted through so long a period.

That satisfaction should not be thus added or imposed is strongly supported by the parable of the father, who received his son when he came back to him from ruin and death. He did not chide, he did not chastise, he did not scourge, he did not imprison him. But he ran to meet him, he kissed and embraced him, and weeping for joy bade his servants put shoes on his feet, put the best robe upon him, and a ring betokening dignity on his finger; then he ordered them to kill the fatted calf and prepare a banquet that they might make merry, rejoice and sing. Was any sort of papal indulgences necessary for this returning son? Obviously a complete return to God is in itself the fruit meet for repentance. Hence conversion alone is satisfaction.

"Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered." And the Psalmist declares who this is by adding, "Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity." In what sense are sins forgiven, if they are still imputed for punishment? For sins that are past, if they are utterly past, so that no evil trace or scar remains in one's will, cannot be imputed in any other way except for punishment. But if sin could be imputed in any other way, then implication and contradiction would follow. Therefore we conclude that if God does not impute past sins, he will not punish them; because, if he punishes them, he will impute sin, since he can impute it in no other way. It follows, therefore, from the word of the Psalmist that

impunity necessarily accompanies all forgiveness. Hence it is an error to suppose that punishment is reserved for those who have died in grace,—except in so far as their grace has not yet reached perfection, which it acquires through its effort and desire to increase love. Therefore the pope, if without punishment he cannot perfect love, does wrong in relaxing the punishments of purgatory. And so I wonder greatly,—indeed I fail to see—how one can be sure that a deadly sin is utterly past. It is like saying a mortal wound can ever utterly pass away; if it could, it is clear that it was not mortal; so also, if a deadly sin does not cause spiritual death, i. e. does not take away the life of the soul, the Holy Spirit, it is not deadly. Hence, if it is deadly, it must cause death, and therefore ignorance of God (for "this is life eternal that they should know the true God"), despisal of God and contempt of God. For the soul with such feelings is dead to God, i.e. in the death caused by sin. This however is the worst of deaths. Therefore deadly sins remain in dead sinners and do not pass away from them any more than mortal wounds from the dead. Only returning life can guarantee that deadly sins are utterly passed away and do not result in a worse death. But life does not return except with the return of the Holy Spirit. Therefore deadly sins never utterly pass away unless the Holy Spirit is renewed in the vitals of the revived dead. Hence, as long as they are in death, if they are punished mortally, they bear the proper fruit of their death. It is most strange that when men see that death is remitted in the restoration of life, they do not also see that the punishment of death, which is the punishment of sin, is also remitted. For will not he, who has granted his consubstantial spirit and life to sinners, grant them release from punishment?

But if it be claimed that, even after the Spirit has been restored, previous sins ought to be punished because they

have been previously committed, then Peter and Magdalene ought to be punished forever, because that they committed mortal sin remains forever true, and therefore they ought to be punished with the punishment due to mortal sin. Or if it be claimed that God has remitted the eternal punishment, but not the temporal: this is nothing else than saying that punishment has not been entirely remitted. But it is strange that he, who has remitted eternal punishment, has not also remitted temporal. Hence it seems more reasonable to say that temporal punishment is due, not for past guilt, but for existing traces of former venial sin, and thus punishment is inflicted venially and temporally on this account. But such punishment will be like the chastisement of sons who offend venially within the range of adoption and grace.

Just as no one takes away poverty without making rich and no one takes away deafness or blindness without restoring hearing or sight, so also no one forgives many sins without making one love much. Truly "her sins which are many are forgiven; for she loved much." And he who gave her love, forgave her. Now sins are called sins, because they are contrary to the Law. But they are also called debts, because they are not paid in accordance with the Law. For a debtor is held bound by the Law, if he does not pay what he owes in accordance with the Law. Hence debt and sin are identical. No one therefore can forgive sin, who cannot forgive debt. But we are in debt to the Law because we do not love God with all our heart, with all our soul, with all our spirit, with all our might, with all our strength, etc. This debt we never pay in this life, and as long as we do not pay it, we remain debtors; and as long as we remain debtors, we remain sinners. But sinners, who remain in sin, are not forgiven the sins in which they remain. Perhaps the Lord, in Magdalene's case, wished to indicate this, viz. that her sins were not

wholly forgiven because she did not altogether love to the full measure of the first commandment. But she was forgiven many sins because she loved much. And in so far as she did not love perfectly, she was still in sin and was not forgiven to that extent. Yet he, who bestowed that measure of love upon her, knew when he would bestow the rest upon her, even unto perfection. And then surely he would wholly forgive every sin and every debt. No one, therefore, even if he occupies the apostolic chair,—not even the Catholic Church spread abroad in the earth,—through any bulls or indulgences whatever can grant plenary forgiveness or remission. And this is an important point in regard to the authority of Councils. For as we know, they have published indulgences of plenary remission in "letters patent," although in truth that belongs to the same authority that forgives many—nay all—sins or debts; for it belongs to God alone to bestow much or perfect love, etc.

In John's baptism men confessed their sins, and so were baptized by John in the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, as is stated in the first chapter of Mark. But Christ's baptism is also a baptism and with fruit more meet for repentance. For the Lord Jesus in calling men to his baptism also said, "Repent ye." Peter, too, on the day of Pentecost said to the Jews, "Repent and be baptized," etc. And yet in this baptism no confession or mention of sins is required, that the faithful may note the generosity of the sacramental gift in which not the slightest previous righteousness is required in order that grace may be given, etc.

And that word of John's, "Bring forth therefore fruit meet for repentance,"—although it terrifies many—ought to comfort us greatly. For John, before his baptism, exacted fruit meet for repentance by commanding him that had two coats or a superabundance of food to give to

those who had none; and called this fruit meet for repentance and the sternness of severity. And in doing so he showed what generosity Christian piety should exercise toward those who confess and are penitent. For while no deadly sin ought to be forgiven on account of septennial labor and sorrow, nevertheless the sinner ought to be received under the kindly protection of mercy. "There is joy in the presence of the angels in heaven over one sinner that repenteth," and yet we on earth impose grief upon him! Far more gently did John's severity deal with penitents than does the authority of canonical law. But Christ's kindness dealt even more gently with them than the just but moderate severity of John.

That thundering word, "Bring forth therefore fruit meet for repentance," at first terrifies and dismays many not a little; for it sounds as if they were not to be received unless they scourged their bodies with much torture of the flesh. But though at first it terrifies the hearer with its thunder, yet it comforts, soothes and relieves him if he examines it carefully. For what is the fruit of repentance if not that the sinner should have his sins forgiven and set aside, and should go in peace with all the sons of grace, at peace with his brothers and in favor with God? Even as Magdalene walked among the sainted sons of God, being reconciled with, united, and acceptable to God. But how could she have been sent away in peace if, after her sins had been forgiven, she had still remained a debtor to the stern law of penance for all the undischarged obligations due to her past disgraceful deeds, as well as her wickedness and crimes? Nay, I think that these charges were either entirely remitted when her sin was forgiven, or that they remained entirely unimpaired in force after the remission of her sin. For when God for any reason partly abates the charge against a penitent, I do not see why for the same reason he does not relax the entire charge,

since he forgives all the sin. Unless perchance God wishes to preserve the sternness of justice in the little rather than in the great. Everyone admits that remission of sin is of more importance than remission of the charge against the sinner. For no man owes punishment except on account of guilt, since if he had been free from guilt, there would be no necessity of his being punished. Therefore, however much of the charge against the penitent these justiciars may relax, so long as there is any part of it remaining, they keep him under the yoke of infinite misery, to atone for which (aside from the high priest Jesus) not all the rest of the world could avail. Hence in the case of Magdalene, who was sent away in peace when seven devils had been driven out of her, I ask what part of the charge remained against her? First, I ask: Did the whole charge remain after her guilt had been forgiven, so that she still fully owed all the punishment which was due for all her sins in accordance with the sternness of the divine Law? I do not think anyone will say that. Then, in order that she may not be left to be tortured forever, not any part of the charge remains for that blessed sinner to pay in punishment. But if no part remains, I ask what charge is there against her? Here my opponents say: "The charge of temporal punishment—into which the charge of eternal punishment through God's merciful indulgence has been changed—still remains. It is indeed due to great mercy in the first place that all her sins are forgiven. In the second place, it is due to great mercy that she does not owe eternal torture. But because all the ways of the Lord are mercy and judgment, he willed that there should be some temporal punishment at least." Those who say this do not see what misery they are imposing upon faithful penitents, what stumbling-blocks, obstacles and hindrances they are placing in the paths of piety. For penitents will be compelled to be forever turning over their former base-

ness in their minds, forever torturing themselves, forever enduring not the discipline of the body which has some slight benefit, but bodily torture, the lashing, scourging, bruising and mortifying of their flesh, never sparing their bodies,—as if a bruised body were a sacrifice to God! While the Prophet on the contrary says, "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." Hence when Christ told Magdalene to go in peace, he did not leave her the necessity of bearing as much punishment as she could in her flesh, even temporal punishment. For what peace is there for a wretched man, even when his transgressions are forgiven, if he is still in the hands of his tormentors? And what difference does it make whether he is tortured by others or by himself? It must be admitted that He that has entirely forgiven all a man's guilt and sent him away in peace, has left him either miserable or comforted. But if comforted, then, inasmuch as all the Lord's works are perfect, he has sent him away fully comforted, so that being freed from all debtors' chains and useless bodily discipline, and having been restored to the kingdom, he may now together with the rest of the sons of God, freely exercise himself unto godliness which is profitable for all things; and this is nothing else than the worship of God. For however much or little a man through past sin has fallen from that greatest and first commandment upon which hang all the Law and the Prophets, he always remains a debtor and is in his sins, to the extent that he is defective in relation to the Law; and he is always defective, when he lets piety go and foolishly gives his chief attention to bodily discipline, which is of but little use. Foolish, therefore, is the opinion of all who hold to penal obligation after guilt is forgiven. Perhaps you will say: "Why then is the opinion of the ancient Fathers, that a penitent should be burdened with the requirement of rendering some sort of

satisfaction, still maintained? Nay, more than that, they have even made satisfaction a necessary part of penance." But of this, elsewhere, etc.

The word "satisfaction," which Decretists and Predicants wish to call the third part in the sacrament of penance, if it be accepted in all strictness, contains not only error, but even blasphemy, and indeed fosters despair. For if Christ, who was with an oath appointed Priest forever over the house of God, was appointed—not uselessly or vainly—but by God in the fullness of grace and truth (for he is full of true grace and all may receive of his fullness), it must be admitted that he is a priest possessed of full priesthood. Hence he must have offered a full and perfect sacrificial victim, perfect first fruits, perfect tithes, perfect peace offerings, a perfect sacrifice, a perfect burnt offering, perfect incense. Hence, too, in his own sacrifice for sin he has made perfect propitiation for the people, perfect reconciliation, perfect purification, perfect restoration, perfect justification, perfect sublimation, perfect atonement in the fullness of grace and truth. There can be no detraction from the fullness of true grace; and whoever detracts from it is charged with blasphemy against the giver and malicious depreciation of the gift. Yet such detraction is made even when a man says that God's grace is not complete, or refuses to admit that his gift, his propitiation, his forgiveness are gratuitous. But how can they be gratuitous, if for the penitent's forgiveness mitigation or redemption it is necessary for him to return its exact value or as much as will satisfy for it? For if it is taken strictly, he does not satisfy unless he returns its equivalent or something more. Perhaps you will say that it is not necessary to satisfy to an equal amount, but only to the extent that satisfaction has not been made through Christ's suffering. And in this you will be in entire accord with the words of Paul, "I fill up that which

is lacking of the afflictions of Christ," words which support the custom of the Church. But the purity of confessants implies the pure grace of God, even through the gratuitous gift of Christ, and in that alone does he trust that he is justified through Christ, not through his own justification. Nevertheless he fills up that which is lacking in the afflictions of Christ in that he does that which is necessarily required for this grace of participating in his suffering. Whoever trusts one who promises, expects the promise and loves the things promised. So far, however, as he works from faith through love, he does indeed live; but in no sense of equity can he render an equivalent either for his former crimes or for his later glory. In releasing Mary Magdalene, Christ required nothing of her except complete faith and love.

Concerning the Sacrament of Penance; Indulgences; and Ecclesiastical Authority.

1. The chief cause of indulgences is in the abuses of quaestors, and their frequently false charges; sometimes too in the impure and corrupt purpose of the pope. But setting these three things aside, we must consider the sincere intention, just cause, and plenary power involved; also the treasury of the Church and the communion of its members under one head. For, "I am a companion of all them that fear God," and "Upon the Pharisees comes all the righteous blood from Abel unto Zachariah, son of Barachiah."

2. Now unless the pope on his own authority can dispense from the treasury,—a power which in reality belongs to a greater grace, the claim for indulgences will considerably stagger and totter.

3. There is a great difference between a minister of the sacraments and a dispenser of graces. Paul touches on

both when he says, "Ministers and stewards of the mysteries of God." The first acts by virtue of his office and is not aware of what he accomplishes. The second acts on his own authority and grants as much as he pleases.

4. As regards the effect of the sacraments upon the participants, it does not belong to the ministers of the Church to determine the degree of grace and fruit to be obtained. Hence no minister of the Church can determine how much grace one who receives the sacrament obtains through baptism or confession or the Eucharist, with more or less preparation for it. For the effects of the sacrament depend upon the attitude of the participant. If one comes worthily to receive baptism or the Eucharist, not even the pope can, on his own authority, measure the grace that is to be obtained through the sacrament.

5. Baptism and penance are the two sacraments by which a son of wrath and darkness can become a son of God and return from death to life. Hence from their nature they do not require any external attestation; and such externals as are added to them,—as for example in baptism—a place, a sponsor, consecrated water, a minister; and—in confession—admittance, the reservation of certain cases, the salutary injunction to repentance;—all these are of the Church, not of God, although they have been profitably devised by wise leaders of the Church, and ought not to be omitted except in case of necessity.

6. If in the sacrament of reconciliation a confessor imposes penance after absolution, he confuses his office. For he is both the minister of the sacrament and also the counsellor to direct the confessant's subsequent life. In the first office he has only to hear and absolve. For the Lord said in regard to the past: "Thy sins are forgiven thee; go in peace." But in adding, "Sin no more," he gave advice for the future in that second office, in which a priest also counsels the confessant to guide him in his sub-

sequent life, pointing him from his remembrance of past sins and his dissatisfaction with them towards subsequent hatred of them.

7. In the first office no penance is imposed, just as there is none in baptism. For the sacrament has been decreed wholly through the generous gift of the legislator and king. And if anyone thinks righteousness must be added to it, he imputes insufficiency to the sacrament, belittles the generous favor of the king, and makes the condition of the sons of the Church worse than that of the sons of perfidy. If this were so, the unfaithful man would be justified by the sacrament alone, while the faithful would not be justified by confession.

8. From the beginning of the infant Church not only was absolution always granted to those who had confessed to the Lord, but the forgiveness of their impious sin was given even to those intending to make confession. The Church however in these later times possesses a more generous gift. Hence sacramental confession is more fruitful now than obedience to a judicial sentence was then. Seldom is anyone justified through sacramental confession, because justification has already been effected through his intention,—and before the gospel by his confession to God. Who imposed so many septennials upon Manassas after the wickedness of his sin had been forgiven? Who imposed twenty-one years upon David for three deadly sins?

9. The office of counsellor imposes penance, since all the remedies for sin may be called by that name. Even baptism is called repentance by St. Peter. And inasmuch as whatever is done subsequently is done by virtue of the office of counsellor, if the confessant, after having confessed, does not accept the counsel, he is under no obligation to fulfil it, not even if he sincerely intends to do it and says that he will,—unless indeed he vows it to God. For

personal promises are to be treated just like one's purposes in his home, and these may be called penance.

10. There is a difference between penance that is enjoined and penance that ought to be enjoined. The former belongs to the counsel of the confessor; the second to divine justice. The first to utility; the second to charity. The first to labor; the second to love. Upon one who is returning or has returned to God nothing ought to be so strictly enjoined as that he should sin no more, but love God sincerely. For purity of heart is in itself complete repentance, and it should be enjoined by the way of instruction and exhortation. It may be taught; but it cannot be attained by exhortation, nor can it be given.

11. God does not command purity of heart simply in order to condemn the transgressor to destruction. But he ordains it because without a pure heart one may not see God.

12. In matters determined solely by the divine Law, the pope may teach, warn and exhort; he cannot command. There is no more obligation upon one who hears the command to love, when the pope commands it, than if he only advises and urges it. For he is sufficiently bound by God's command and there is no need of any greater obligation. But if the pope cannot mandatorily obligate the faithful beyond the obligation of divine Law, it follows that he cannot command in accordance with his own wish beyond the divine command.

13. The faithful are servants of God in the service of *latria* which is derived from λατρεύειν; they are not servants of the pope, either through *dulia* or through *latria*. For the law of Christ is the Law of perfect liberty.

14. In relation to the 12th and 13th points one must not overlook the word of the Apostle, "Teach with all authority." This statement is self-explanatory. It

means: "Teach with the authority of the divine command, not your own."

15. The minister of the Church merely administers the sacraments, but leaves their effect and fruit to the searcher of the heart.

16. Plenary indulgence is the actual removal of every obstacle that hinders the beatific vision, just as perfect repentance is true and sincere purity of heart. Both are from God alone.

17. The most perfect penance is the injunction to "Sin no more," which a minister of the Church may advise; he cannot command or give it. Therefore he cannot authoritatively enjoin any other lesser repentance.

18. It is possible to make perfect repentance, even when there is no plenary indulgence; as is clear in the case of John the Baptist from the time of his beheading even till the passion of the Lord. And in the case of John the Evangelist the Church does not know whether with Peter and James and Andrew he attained perfect repentance in the fatherland or with Enoch and Elias in the way.

19. The Lord Jesus commanded his faithful servants to trade with the talents entrusted to them until he should come. And the pope cannot by any decision or valuation of his own—make the trading of the servants who gained three talents equal to five talents.

20. "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation costly stones, gold, silver, hay, wood, stubble, the fire shall prove each man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss, but his spirit shall be saved, yet so as through fire."

21. No mortal man can distinguish—even with regard to his own work—the difference in the materials built upon this foundation, even though all may have truly confessed, either in due form or its equivalent, and are

contrite. For the spirit of each individual will be saved; yet so as through fire.

22. No mortal knows what sort of fire is to try every man's work. For the expression concerning fire is figurative no less than that concerning costly stones, gold, silver, wood, hay, stubble. Yet the figure indicates that it must be a fire that consumes, as well as that the above materials are combustible.

23. But if no mortal can distinguish in this way, surely it is clear that no mortal on his own authority can change one thing for another, so that, e. g. he that has built wood upon that foundation, will have built gold through the pope's decision to that effect, or that the fire will not prove hay or stubble otherwise than silver or gold. The diversity of opinion upon this point and the conflicting statements of the Doctors make it a question of very grave doubt. Hence the faithful are free to hold to the catholic opinion or to a Doctor, to examine the several opinions, and to form their own opinion, so long as they exercise due reason in sailing around the shore of the sacred Canon,—of the Canon, I say, of Sacred Scripture.

24. The saints in the holy city of Jerusalem share certain things in common; for David says that he is the companion of all them that fear God. So there are certain riches of supererogation in the treasury, in which citizens share by just distribution according to their greater or less dignity.

25. The one body of the faithful in the Holy Church, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, is quickened through its more exalted members, from whom it receives its more important gifts. But the collecting and uniting of these members in the body and their spiritual quickening is the work of God alone. And although this is the merit of Christ as a man, nevertheless it is the work of Christ as God.

26. But if the pope on his own authority were able to estimate and appraise the value of the works of piety, it would overthrow the foundation of the piety of the ancient Fathers, who thought God ought to be served in holiness and righteousness all the days of one's life. For it would necessitate serving the pope as one's master rather than God, submitting—with a little money,—in order that after true confession and contrition, being freed by a moment's labor, one might escape without effort from the hands of one's enemies. For otherwise the penalty is servitude in the hands of our enemies.

27. If however the pope were an absolute judge, he would no longer be the vicar of Christ, but Christ would be his vicar. For Christ's judgment would then depend upon the pope's will.

28. The great foundation of the kingdom of God is to be found in the Spirit, in the fruit of the Spirit, in the harvest, in the life of the just, in the nature of Paul's walk, in love, in grace, "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy," etc., "Building upon it," etc.

29. "With all men follow after the sanctification, without which no man shall see the Lord."

30. "Unto each one of us was the grace given according to the measure of the gift of Christ." Christ alone measures the gift.

31. "See that ye walk in wisdom, redeeming the time." For an easier summary of their duty Paul might have given them the path of a thousand years of indulgences. Perfect purity of heart is perfect restoration of the inner man. Perfect restoration of the inner man consists in becoming the perfect image of God. The perfect image of God is the perfect conforming of the inner man to God. The true riches of the Church consist in true purity of heart, in the restoration of the inner man, in its perfect conformation to what ought to be its image.

All the members participate under one head. The citizens of Jerusalem share in common to this very end. David also was the companion of all them that fear God. The Pharisees likewise shared in the blood of every righteous man from Abel unto Zachariah, and they with their own hands killed Zachariah between the sanctuary and the altar, although Zachariah had been killed more than six hundred years before the time of Christ. Who was it that at that time dispensed the treasures of Satan, that the Pharisees might share in that murder? Neither Satan nor Caiaphas; and yet they did share in it.

As to the time of judgment and decision, when souls are stationed on the right hand or on the left forever,—whether it is to be in the death of the flesh or after its death,—this question Augustine leaves undecided in his *De Civitate;* see the beginning of Chapter IX, Book XIII.

Concerning the Sacrament of Penance; Indulgences; and the Authority of Prelates of the Church.

1. With regard to the above statements on the subject of indulgences, note especially the words of Augustine in his *De Trinitate*, Book VIII, Chapter IV, where he says, "We shall never see God unless we already love him here and now."

2. But one should add, "and love him with a pure heart and love him perfectly." This the pope cannot grant.

3. The heart is cleansed by faith, not by the will of the pope, by faith, made eager through love to be thoroughly cleansed until the heart is fit and meet to see God. This is what Augustine means.

4. The pope can teach, but not command in accordance with the will of God. For his command is no more binding than his teaching of the commandments of God. If however he cannot command in accordance with the

will of God, he cannot command even in accordance with his own will. For Christians are not the servants of the pope, but the servants of God only. And this service in Greek is λατρεία from λατρεύειν. Yet one must not overlook the word, "Teach with all authority."

5. The pope merely administers the sacraments, leaving their effect and fruit to the searcher of the heart.

6. Plenary indulgence is the actual removal of every obstacle that hinders the beatific vision, just as perfect repentance is the true and sincere cleansing of the heart. The first is from God alone; the second takes place in the rational creature, but is nevertheless from God alone. In connection with the second the most perfect penance is the injunction, "Sin no more."

7. In the Church, Paul supplied what the suffering of Christ lacked, and David was the companion of all them that fear God. There is therefore a certain treasury of riches, a sharing on the part of the heavenly Jerusalem. Hence inferiors receive from their superiors, and hence even superiors are enriched through a certain superabundance—by their inferiors. But the dispensing of this treasure belongs solely to him, who knows how to assign the citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem—each to his own station. And the Holy Spirit will infuse life and action into each member, according to the rank and place he receives through the Father's will, as it is seen in perfection in the body of the perfect man Christ. In that body the pope cannot make the foot become the hand or the eye, neither can he command it. This has been reserved altogether for God to dispose.

8. The pope signs himself "the servant of servants," not only in humility but in truth. For Christ, when he commanded him, though their minister, to become the least of all among them, did not command him to lie. But he makes it incumbent upon him under penalty of

greater transgression that his delight should be in the Law of God and that on this he should meditate day and night. So a mother cares for a sick son, demanding nothing of him. On this compare the 4th point above.

9. Paul was again in travail of the Corinthians in the bowels of love, until Christ should be formed in them. Therefore he exercised the function of a mother, not only wishing, but being obliged to do so, even as a mother is bound to serve her sick sons, caring for their health with all zeal.

10. The pope, like Paul, with maternal affection growing out of love, ought to serve all the servants of God. And he is the servant of the servants of God because greater love is due to them, not because they are of lower rank on account of their poverty.

11. Men who are sailing amid storms and tempests with an experienced but worn out pilot may oppose him; yet in the end they ought to obey him. But on the other hand if the pilot is drunken and falls asleep, if he lets go his hold on the helm and allows the ship to be driven and tossed hither and thither, men who are skilled in the sea and seamanship not only may cast him aside and take the helm, they ought to do so, consulting for their own safety and for the safety of their companions in the ship. So should it be also in Peter's boat.

12. The penance to be enjoined is "Sin no more." And if one keeps this injunction perfectly, he is pure in heart. This therefore is the most perfect penance. And just as absolution and indulgence follow repentance, so plenary indulgence follows perfect repentance. For "blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

13. The common people look upon indulgences in one way, Roman pontiffs in another. For a pope regards plenary forgiveness as a result of the penance he has

enjoined; the people regard it as an unobstructed passage to blessedness.

14. No one can grant plenary forgiveness unless he can give plenary indulgence.

15. No one can give plenary indulgence unless he can give what is required for it, viz. repentance, contrition, grace, love, purity of heart.

16. The pope cannot know the obstacles which keep or separate a beloved son from his father's kiss. For the pope knows nothing of what is transpiring before God's tribunal except through the confession of the penitent.

17. No penitent can know the obstacles on account of which God justly decides that a son of adoption, one already having his Son's spirit, ought not yet to be admitted to the embrace and kiss of the Father.

18. "Teach with all authority," is a compound statement, concerning two persons, God and the pupil. For the word, "Teach," Paul refers to the pupil; while the word, "with authority," refers to God, whose decrees ought to be taught with the authority of a weightier power than that of any emperor. However, Paul says rather, "Reprove with all authority." This statement must be limited in the same way as the former. It should mean, "Reprove by teaching in accordance with all divine authority." For otherwise we would be slaves under a more grievous yoke than are the Jews, since we would be transgressors of a double command.

19. The Church could not be branded with any more serious scandal than that bishops should be empowered to issue commands by their own absolute authority. This ought to be a greater source of alarm to kings and princes than the approaching birth of Christ was to Herod and the Romans.

20. Whenever obedience to a canon is followed by as great an evil as that which compelled its enactment, then

changed conditions in the times, in the very nature of the case, repeal the canon.

21. But if the pope can command nothing in matters determined solely by divine Law, e. g. in regard to loving God, he cannot command that his canons should be obeyed under penalty of mortal sin. Canons are merely directions and counsels issued by the wise.

22. The pope cannot—by his own appraisal of it—set a higher value upon a meritorious work than God does. For if he could, he would not be the vicar of Christ, but Christ would be his vicar, etc.

To what Extent the Statutes and Commands of Prelates are binding; and how far they must be kept.

Should the authority of the prelates of the church in respect to the obligation due to their commands and statutes be limited by a proper regard for their rank? In considering this question, the word of the Lord concerning the observance of the traditions of the elders is of no little weight. For the authority of these elders is fixed not less by the Lord when he says in Deut. XVII (?), "And cursed shall be every soul that does not heed the word of the elders when by reason of a difference of judgment they shall go up to the place which the Lord shall choose," than by the authority of the New Testament in the word, "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that rejecteth you, rejecteth me." But this is said concerning decrees which are made in accordance with God, of God, and in God. On the other hand, if the prelates set aside the commands of God and enjoin their own man-made commands, however much they may have become the successors of the apostles, what they do and command is of no avail. Nay more, if the apostles themselves should do

this on the authority of an apostle, they would not have to be obeyed. For in his letter to the Galatians, Paul warns the Church not to believe even himself if he should preach anything else than the truth which they had received. Hence arises that dense forest of decrees and decretals which by their very minuteness abolish the study of the Sacred Scriptures, hinder our knowledge of them, and compel us to abandon them, thus causing guilt to arise because of the neglect of so great a command of God. So the decision of the elders, even on the subject of sacrifices—a divine concern,—had no weight, when it failed to foster that loyalty to parents which had been established by God's command.

The Farrago

V

Concerning the Communion of Saints

CONCERNING THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS

What the True Communion of Saints is; concerning the Treasure of the Church; concerning Sharing and Dispensing this Treasure; concerning Brotherhoods, etc.

All the saints share in a true and essential unity, even as many as unitedly hold fast to Christ in one faith, one hope, one love. It matters not under what prelates they may live, or how ambitiously these prelates may dispute, or disagree, or wander from the truth, or even become heretical. It matters not by what distances of space or what intervals of years the saints may be separated. This is the fellowship of the holy, concerning which we say in the creed: "I believe in the communion of saints." Hence all our fathers have shared in it together with us, being baptized with the same baptism and refreshed with the same spiritual food and revived by the same spiritual rock as ourselves. This unity and union of the saints is in no wise destroyed by differences, or advanced by agreement, among their rulers. For the godly are not harmed in the least by the ungodliness of their rulers, nor even by their heretical perversion. On the other hand, it is agreed that it is perfectly possible for a truly godly Greek in Constantinople, who is subject to his schismatic Patriarch, to believe all that a Latin in Rome believes. How then does the heretical perversion of his rulers harm him? Hence the unity of the Church under one pope is merely accidental; although it contributes greatly to the com-

munion of saints, it is not essential thereto, since it depends upon the subjection to one ruler of those who may have no fellowship with him. For each has fellowship with persons like himself; the godly man with the godly, the faithful man with the faithful; and in the same way the ungodly man has fellowship with the ungodly, the thief with thieves, the adulterer with adulterers, etc.

Concerning the Power of the Pope, the Treasure of the Church, and the Sharing and Dispensing of this Treasure.

Neither the pope nor the General Council has the power to enrich anyone from the treasure of the Church either in part or in full, unless able to renew such an one in heart, and kindle within him a desire that the true treasure of the Church shall indeed become a treasure to him. Hence those who cannot rouse the heart to possess that treasure, cannot grant anyone the possession of it. The pope can desire, beg, beseech, trust, command, thank; perhaps he can, now and then, even obtain his request through prayer; but I do not believe that he can authoritatively present or formally command a presentation, since he cannot provide the indispensable requisites to its preparation. For by no office or work or decision of his, can he make all those who formally approach or draw near to God to be what they ought to be. Now if he cannot provide things that are uncertain and imperfect, how can he provide those that are more important and perfect? How can he, who cannot prepare one worthily, bring him to a glorious perfection? Even as both depend upon God alone, so also they can come only from God. The universal Church triumphant shall not be made perfect without us and our great merit. But what advantage has been provided in this, except that the saints importune in our behalf night

and day? I do not observe, however, that they authoritatively bestow justifying charity or love. For no one regards anything as a treasure except as he sets his heart upon it. A boy treasures nuts and fruits; to a fool gold and gems are but refuse. Therefore that only is a treasure which the heart so estimates. Hence the pope cannot give to those who do not regard the treasure of the Church as a treasure, nor can he cause it to become a treasure to them. If, therefore, anyone truly wishes to share in the treasure of the Church, let him become a partaker of love. And if anyone wishes to be enriched out of the treasure, let him become rich in love and affection. But if anyone wishes to be made altogether rich, let him love fully and perfectly; every other way is vain. Anthony and Paul (who had not the slightest conception of the plenary authority of a Roman pontiff) trod this way in the Thebaid and Scythia. Yet I think that when they died they passed in safety, unhindered to God, with full remission, full reward, and full fruition. Nor could they have passed to God more quickly if a Roman pontiff had compassionately granted them full remission.

The communion of saints is an article of faith, from which the pope can exclude no one against his will; nor should he do so. And if any man is outside this communion, the pope cannot of himself establish him in it of his own will. But, like Peter and Paul, by the faithful administration of his office he can bring it about that those who become fellow-citizens of the saints and inmates of God's household should share in the union with the saints. Each man in the degree of his own love and calling in God and the Lord Jesus has his measure of communion or exclusion, and it is through no decision or decree of the pope that he has more or less communion with the saints or is excluded from it. Like Moses and Paul, the

pope ought to be willing to be blotted from the book of life and to wish to become anathema for the sake of the brethren who do not yet share in the union, etc. (see above).

Saint Peter, the first pope, through the Holy Spirit annulled all the ways and approaches to the kingdom except the ladder of the ten steps, and declares that this alone richly supplies the entrance into the kingdom of God and our Saviour. And this he does, not by the authority of a high pontiff, who may err, but by the authority of God's Spirit, speaking through him. Therefore, prophetically through Peter, the Holy Spirit is seen to have explicitly condemned and rejected any form of indulgences. For he says expressly: "He that lacketh these things," i. e. these ten things, viz. "escape from the corruption of worldly lust, faith supplied by anxious diligence, virtue, self-control, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, love: he that lacketh these things is blind, feeling his way with his hand, having forgotten the cleansing from his own sins." He likewise says: He that possesseth these things, "unto him shall be richly supplied the entrance into the kingdom of the Saviour." This bull, therefore,—not Saint Peter's—but the Holy Spirit's, being issued by Peter and canonically accepted by the Church—the one, unique, indubitable bull—is truly and perfectly of the nature of an indulgence. And no other way that is longer or that promises plenary remission is to be accepted.

This ladder and genuine bull of indulgences is as follows:

1. Escaping from the corruption that is in the world by lust.
2. Adding all diligence.
3. In your faith, supply virtue.
4. In your virtue, knowledge.

5. In your knowledge, self-control.
6. In your self-control, patience.
7. In your patience, godliness.
8. In your godliness, brotherly kindness.
9. In your brotherly kindness, love.

"For if these things are yours and abound," i. e. exist in you perfectly, "they make you to be not idle nor unfruitful unto the knowledge of our Lord. For he that lacketh these things is blind, feeling his way with his hand, having forgotten the cleansing from his old sins." Hence without these there is no key of the kingdom, nor any cleansing. "Wherefore, brethren, give the more diligence by your good works to make your calling and election sure," etc.

> Concerning the True Communion of Saints, from which none can exclude another; in which none but God alone can make one share; and in which Every Man is retained however much he may have been excluded.

All men, from the beginning of the rational soul that is breathed into them even until death, are wayfarers, and all share in the one common supply of the light that shineth in the darkness. But certain of the wayfarers hate this light that shineth in the darkness, close their ears in order not to hear the words of the Law, and corrupt their ways in order not to keep the Law. And for this reason, there is another and more brotherly fellowship among the wayfarers that walk in the ways of the Lord and hear what divine Wisdom speaks among them: for it speaks peace among them. And those who, "not having the Law, do by nature the things of the Law, these are a law unto themselves, showing the work of the Law written in their hearts." All these have the right to become and to

be the children of God. Hence their communion consists of a fraternal relation to each other in God. And none can exclude a man from this communion or make him share in it but God alone. Every man is retained in this communion, however much he may have been excluded. And he that possesses the greater fatherly love in God—and hence the most love for his brethren—shares most in this communion of the sons of God. It follows that when one rejoices more sincerely in his brother's welfare than his brother himself does, he participates the more largely in it, since he receives greater benefit from it. Hence one can readily see that each man shares in his brother's advantages just so far as he is drawn by fervent desire for them. It is not, therefore, the charters of the brotherhoods that make their members share in watchings and fastings, in discipline and in prayers; but it is the union of brotherly love. Hence the angels in heaven, in rejoicing over one sinner that repenteth, share in the penitent's blessing. The Prophet too says that he is "the companion of all them that fear God," since he reaps full handfuls of his desires among them all,—and that too without any loss on their part. This is that essential communion and fraternal brotherhood of the sons of God, from which no ecclesiastical power can exclude, and to which none can introduce a man. Hence every man shares in the watchings and fastings, the observances and prayers of all religious orders, if he greatly desires blessings for them, even if no prior or Chapter has given him papers for this. Nay more, if he desires such blessings for them with more fervent longing than they themselves, he himself will share in them more than they that engage in them; for he will reap fuller handfuls of godliness by reason of his blessed joy, and that without any loss to them. He will also reap in their gain; for the Lord, listening to his desire, will make them more fervent in love.

Concerning Brotherhoods and Sharing in their Treasures, a Subject that has been treated Carelessly and Indifferently by others.

Now it is very strange that among all these learned men, many of whom have touched upon the matter of brotherhoods and the distribution of the treasure of a monastic college among outsiders and benefactors, not one has profoundly studied and investigated the question: How far the prior of a house has the right to allow a benefactor to share in this treasure; whether it should be proportioned to the piety of the benefactor, or the favor of the ruling prior. For the Scripture clearly says: "He that giveth to a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward." Nevertheless I do not think that he will receive a part of the righteous man's reward, in the sense that the righteous man will receive any the less reward because of what the benefactor will receive. But he, together with the righteous man, will receive the reward. For even if he has not loved righteousness before, yet, inasmuch as he does in fact love righteousness in the man whom he believes to be righteous, he will receive a righteous man's reward, just so far as he loves righteousness. And the righteous man's reward is not granted or bestowed by the righteous man, but by the Lord, the searcher of hearts, the discerner of the thoughts and the intents of the heart, who knows the degree of love with which the giver regarded righteousness, when he gave to the righteous man. For it may be that the former regarded righteousness with a greater love than was felt for it by the latter; and therefore he will receive a righteous man's reward in greater measure than the latter, though he will not receive the latter's reward.

Nor is it probable that the brotherhoods will appoint all their benefactors to share in all their works, though

the Saintly Doctor and most of the other Doctors since his time think they should; and the common practice of religious bodies implies it. Strange to say, they do not do so with regard to their prayers, though they have it in their power; for they can pray for whomsoever they wish and as much as they wish. Yet because the merit of another's prayer is neither known nor assured nor under their control, they do not promise to make anyone share in it, but commit the outcome and fruit of it to God, in so far as he may deign to hear them. Now these very men promise a distribution from all the merits and rewards they have stored up, as if appointing another person to be the possessor of their own possessions, and depriving themselves at least of that part which is received by the outsider who has been admitted and appointed to obtain it. They should manage the brothers more cautiously by not appointing any outsider, for fear that there would not be enough for these and themselves; and a greater schism of love would not result, if this precaution were observed. But lest we be compelled to admit this, let us bring that participation back to the merits of the participant, and refer the distribution to God who knows and accepts him. For, to whatever extent I, in my heart and from my heart, in deed or word, shall be a blessing to them that fear God, to that extent will I esteem the fear of God and them that fear God.

Moreover it is the measure of one's love of the fear of God and of them that fear God that determines what his reward will be among them; and then he becomes the companion of all them that fear God without any loss to them (for the participation in Jerusalem is peculiar in this, that there is intercourse there without any loss of the light that is shared by all, and all things there are done in the light); even as the Psalmist used to honor them that fear God, without loss to them. And he on his part,

does not receive his share from them that fear God, but from God who knows the measure of his love. Thus "he that giveth to a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward, and he that giveth to a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward" from Him, who knows how much he loves the righteous man and the prophet in giving to them. For his love, not his work, will be rewarded. "For if I bestow all my goods to feed the poor," etc. Each man shall receive praise from God, and "good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over into his bosom,"—from God, I say, and not by the decision of temporal prelates. For as they possess no arbitrary power over the effect of the sacraments, so they have even less over the merits of piety. The prelacy can bestow no higher blessing than that for which it is established. And it was established in order to secure a peaceful and inoffensive life for the servants of God with one another, in so far as the foresight and care of human frailty, aided by God, can secure it. But a prelate has no power to make a man more and more pleasing to God, nor does his authority extend as far as this. Under the guise of piety, through wills, they lay claim to fields and houses. Thus, through the words of the Saintly Doctor and through their own benedictions, they obtain disgraceful gain. But of these matters elsewhere.

Here follow some Propositions.

1. God has not made anyone's lot worse because of the corrupt purpose of the head of a monastery.

2. The lot of pious monks would be greatly endangered, if through the decision of the head of the house the merits of any one of the brethren could be transferred to another.

3. The ruler of a monastery is neither the master, nor judge, nor depositary, nor dispenser of either the collective or individual merits of its members.

4. For all merits—of whatever sort they may be—are personal, not real; the result of grace, not of Law. And every one is bound and obligated to gain as much merit as he can, whether by preaching, or interceding, or teaching, warning, exhorting, persuading, advising, aiding, approving, stimulating, or doing anything else whatsoever.

5. Hence a man may secure a higher position—one that is profitable for himself and for others, and thereby do more for others than duty requires; yet—in view of his position—he has done no work of supererogation. For God will render to every man according to his works. Where merit abounds, the reward is more abundant.

6. The possessions, the shares, the inheritances, the rights of the citizens of Jerusalem are not like those of the Egyptians and Chaldeans in that one man possesses more as another possesses less.

7. Sharing with others in that heavenly Jerusalem, which is built as a city, is peculiar in this, that it does not involve loss to any possessor.

8. There, one finds that blessed possession of the highest good, whereby each man has full possession and none is at a disadvantage with another. Nay more, the greater the number of possessors that share in it, the more extensive is the possession of each one.

9. Hence from such participation no straitened circumstances, no want, injustice, envy, or complaint can arise.

10. Although, in that sharing, each one has a right to his own individual share, nevertheless no one is so entirely the master of his share that he is able to share it with whomsoever he pleases.

11. There, the distribution of places will be like that of the appointments in a palace where the will of the prince produces efficiency and order, or like the activity of the members in the body, in which the spirit produces life and action.

12. But if the saints that have already attained heaven are not masters of their own shares, much less are they that are still in the way, not knowing yet whether they are worthy of hatred or love.

13. Moses offered to have his name blotted out of the book of life for the sake of the people of Israel.

14. Paul desired to become anathema from Jesus for the sake of the brethren.

15. Paul died daily for the glory of the brethren; he gladly spent and was spent for the salvation of the brethren, and filled up that which was lacking of the afflictions of Christ.

16. All these merits of Paul and Moses, although they aided the people unto salvation and assisted them in many ways, yet they are only merits for Paul and Moses; for neither Paul nor Moses could present them to others. They could pray, and obtain their request; but to present belongs only to him, whose prerogative it is to estimate and reward, to present and inspire and accept, and plant and water, to give increase and to preserve.

17. It was not because of their meanness or niggardliness, but because of their wisdom that the wise virgins, when they were urged, refused to give the oil, which they took with them in their vessels, to the foolish virgins.

18. It is only foolish virgins who are found begging for another's oil. It will not be given to anyone because of his mendicancy.

19. We are all beggars from one who is rich, we are restored by the merit of one, we are reconciled by the obedience of one, who occupies his place, not by merit,

but by inborn right. But he has transferred the reward of his labor and service to us, so that we are bought and enrolled citizens under one born king, who alone is the master of the kingdom and the dispenser of royal dignities. "For neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase."

What one ought to think concerning the Foundations of Masses; and their Benefit to those who endow them.

Those who contribute temporal possessions toward the maintenance of priests in order to celebrate masses intend that the masses should be said in order to render satisfaction for penalties they deserve or to lessen their own guilt, evidently expecting that a mass will benefit a contributor more than others who do not contribute. The question then arises: Is the intention of such a contributor right? Now it is evident that this ought not to be passed over perfunctorily or with dry foot. For the effects and fruits of the sacraments do not arise solely from the intention of either the ministrant or the recipient. This is clear in the daily experience of the faithful. For when a priest celebrates in order that the person for whom he is celebrating may become strong against temptation, it does not always follow that the latter is forthwith made strong to resist,—even if he for whom the Eucharist is offered has that special intention. For the effects of the sacraments are dependent upon the inclination of the partaker, and upon an inclination requisite for the intention. But the requisite inclination for the efficacy of this sacrament is a hungering and thirsting for the life-giving food and drink. Hence the less one hungers and thirsts for it, the less also will be the effect he receives. And this is what the Apostle means when he says, "He that

gathered little, had little; and he that gathered much, had much."

Nevertheless it is hard that those who provide benefits should not be at all benefited thereby. On the other hand, those who provide them are generally rich and worldly. And it is always the case that he who fills the hungry with blessings lets the disdainful and scornful go away empty. For the rich of this world have their consolations in this world, hunger and thirst but little, and hence are but little replenished with blessings. Now it is not true that he who neither hungers nor thirsts—as in the case of one who neither wishes nor runs—does not receive the recompense he deserves. Nevertheless those who do hunger and thirst are always filled with blessings, and those who wish and run always obtain, in accordance with the measure of their thirst; even though the ministrant of the sacrament or mass may not have this intention. For one receives refreshment at this table as a result of the hunger of the listener rather than the intention of the celebrant. And it is not in the power or choice of the priest to determine how much the man, for whom he is celebrating, ought to receive; nay more, it is not in the choice of either of them. Hence they do not know what effect will be produced, whether of remission or oblation; although the Lord Jesus indicated two effects, viz. redemption and remission,—redemption for many and the remission of sins, etc.

It is hoped, however, that for him who hungers much, much may be wiped away; I mean, for him who hungers after righteousness; and more for him than for the man who hungers merely after abolition of punishment or of sin. For the sacraments of faith are always instruments whose efficacy depends on the amount of faith exercised. Just as when art is torpid and sleepy, its instruments are ineffective; so the sacraments of a sleepy faith are useless.

It is not therefore the money that is given, nor the priest, nor the mass, nor the sacrifice, but the participation and communion that produces abolition of punishment or of sin, even as it is this that gains and obtains redemption and remission. When the Lord Jesus established the Eucharist for redemption as well as for remission, he truly instituted the abolition in righteousness without any penal suffering. For the eating of it imparts the benefit of his suffering to him that eateth worthily of it. This follows from the statement: "As often as ye" etc., because the communion of his body and blood is for redemption and remission.

Hence the faithful and pious, as well as the priests, can have a part in the same intention for the dead. Consecration is a matter of rank, communion of piety. Therefore a devout woman is no less concerned in what is done in the mass than a devout priest, since she shares with equal piety in the body and blood. For whatever one does there without piety, however much it may be in the exercise of his office, he always does to his judgment, whether he consecrates sacramentally or eats spiritually.

Indeed there may be intention without any discerning affection in one or the other of the two participants, and thus that which was instituted and conferred to impart life may be received to one's judgment and guilt. Nay, the result may be that both ministrant and founder will receive no benefit from it, inasmuch as, though they take part in the service, by their intention they may be excluded therefrom. For the sacrifice that is offered solely for the founder may not bear fruit solely for him; nay more, it may not bear fruit for either the founder or the celebrant,—but both may be excluded, since it is solely for him who with hungry throat and thirsting palate awaits refreshment.

How then did the founder profit by his contribution of

alms to the work of the ministry? Much, provided he was greatly stirred by love in thus contributing; otherwise, but little. For I am confident of this, that the great piety of an officiating priest contributes but little to a founder who has bestowed a favor, if the latter counteracts it by great disdain. Therefore our salvation is not established upon another's work, but our kingdom depends solely upon ourselves: we reign to the extent that we attain to it. And we attain to it, not through another's promotion of us, but by the steps of our own mind and our own desire. It is a kingdom of the mind, it demands a change of mind. By this I do not mean that no person can receive the fruit of salvation as a result of the prayers of others; but that he never receives it unless he has been changed in mind thereby, thus receiving (whatever his intention) as much fruit of redemption or remission or satisfaction, as the faith with which one or both of the participants approach the sacrament; and this approach cannot be made safe by the action of the mind.

Here, from a different point of view, it is worth while to consider how much a founder is benefited by the exclusion of others, with the result that the oblation is made solely for him; as if he thought that there would be a loss of the light that was granted to him when any one else made use of the same sun! Each one makes his own sun by his turning toward it. And if I wish to exclude another man from it in order that I may not receive less, I am unjust, not only to my nearest brother, but to the sun itself. Therefore each man's turning toward God is the link that binds him to God in such a union that he partakes according to his desire, no matter by what celebrant the oblation is offered. Nay, he that believeth eateth, even if no outward offering be made anywhere. This is proved by Paul, the first hermit, who tarried so many years in the wilderness. For if he had not eaten the flesh of the Son

of man and drunk his blood, he would not have had life in himself. But he did have life in that wilderness; therefore he ate in that wilderness. But how did he eat, when there was no priest at hand, unless he ate and drank through his own hunger, his own thirst? It follows that a sacrifice renders satisfaction only so far as he, for whom satisfaction is to be made, is fit for the gift. But he is fit for it to the extent that he desires it, even if no one celebrates mass for him. And on the other hand, if the whole world were offered for one who disdains it, little satisfaction or none at all were made. For he puts his disdain in the way; oil does not flow when there are no empty vessels to receive it. Hence when men say that a mass that is celebrated for many does not profit each one as much as if it were celebrated for but one, I think it false; but that is simply my own judgment. For it profits each one to the extent that he is spiritually changed and helped, not to the extent that the celebrant desires. For it is a sacrament, and it is the administration of a sacrament. A sacrament is equal and just toward all. The administration of it similarly is in some degree the same toward all. So likewise in certain prayers. In certain respects, however, it depends upon the inclination of the recipients or the celebrants. And in the latter it is not merely the merit of the celebrant. This we clearly see in the prayers that are offered that high pontiffs may lead an exemplary life. Yet often the intercessions of the most saintly men avail nothing since they are resisted by the contrary inclinations of the pontiffs, thus nullifying the prayers of the entire assemblage of the faithful, among whom unquestionably there are many most saintly men. Even though these prayers are uttered in the ministry of the Eucharist, they are not efficacious in proportion to all the virtue of the Eucharist. But the piety of him who offers them, as well as of him for whom they are

offered, would contribute much to make them more efficacious.

Concerning the Abuse and Misapprehension of Masses.

It is indeed foolish to say that the physical eating of the Eucharist has power of atonement in behalf of the person who partakes of it to lessen in any degree his punishment. It is foolish to say that the number of consecrations accomplishes this; for if so, thirty or three hundred sacrifices ought to be consecrated at a single mass. Therefore, if there is benefit from every mass, we should consider whence it arises, etc.

Concerning Unmarried Life—in view of the Statement of the Master of Sentences with regard to Necessary Union; Opinions of Antoninus and Thomas concerning Virginity and Master Wessel's Discussion thereof.

In view of the statement of the Master of Sentences with regard to necessary union, Antoninus—in the 4th part of his work under the 4th topic—grants his conclusions concerning unmarried life, first admitting that essential virginity may exist in a woman violated (against her will), just as grandeur may exist in a poor man. Augustine in his book on the blessing of married life says, "The merit of continence in John, who had no experience of married life, is the same as that in Abraham who begat sons." According to Thomas, merit is not merely weighed by the quality of an act, but even more by the character of the man that performs it. Abraham had a character so disposed that he would have been ready to preserve celibacy, if it had been necessary. And hence conjugal

merit in him is equal to the merit of celibate continence in John. But this St. Thomas understands as referring, not to accidental, but to essential merit, upon which of course all virtues depend.

The purpose, which renders unmarried life praiseworthy, is to have unhindered leisure for God. Martyrs, Doctors, and members of religious orders make more and greater renunciation than do celibates, in order to have leisure for God. (Thomas). And in Chapter VIII Thomas says that in the future life they shall neither marry nor be given in marriage, but shall be as the angels of God; and therefore all shall be unmarried. Likewise in the same place he says that an aureole should not be given to "the little ones," inasmuch as it is given for an act (*actus*) and not for a habit (*habitus*) of love that is bestowed although he admits that the habit of virginity can be maintained only by an outpouring of the Spirit. In *Secunda Secundae* St. Thomas holds that a vow is a necessary and essential part of celibacy. Yet in the same chapter he holds that a firm resolution to be continent throughout life, even without a vow, may be true celibacy and a virtue. Also in the same place he adds that if celibacy included a vow, it would not be essentially self-restraint, but truth and righteousness; and thus would be being by means of the accidental (*ens per accidens*), just as is fasting in connection with a vow. The completeness of the resolution, not of the act, suffices for celibacy. For virtue, there is need of stedfastness that is voluntary, not stedfastness that is obligatory. In religion, there is need of stedfastness that is both voluntary and required; hence a vow is necessary.

Now if carnal innocence is to receive the "accidental" aureole of celibacy, then all undefiled innocence of mind would receive an "accidental" aureole thereby. So that one would receive it because he never worshiped idols,

another because he never broke an agreement, another because he never swore falsely, another because he never stole, another because he never was angry without good reason,—and so on for countless other reasons. Therefore there would be not merely three but countless aureoles. Further, if defiled mental innocence cannot be altogether restored to its first purity through the Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world, to this extent at least it must be admitted that the Lamb did not altogether bear these sins. But if on the other hand he does take them away completely, then he restores completely. And if indeed he restores completely, it will be as perfectly as if this innocence had never been injured. I admit the splendor of the glory of the Virgin Mother in her virginity. I further admit that in the case of all virgins, like Thecla and Agnes, it is a glittering gem in their crown of honor. But to those, to whom it has not been given to keep this undimmed, it has been given—through that same Lamb—in purity of mind to follow the Lamb afterwards, wherever he goes. Now therefore: What constitutes virginity? When is a person blameless? When does he follow the Lamb, wherever he goes? Peter was not following him with irreproachable soul when he said, "I know not the man." But now that he has been restored to perfect love, I ask in what he is lacking, that he does not follow the Lamb in all his ways? And since he has been completely restored, what now has he less than if he had always remained stedfast? Is it in any way easier for God to restore the soundness of faith that has been defiled than that of the flesh? It is true, it seems that one would be bold to settle this question here and now against the uniform objections of the Scholastics. But I am forced to believe that a complete restoration from all backslidings has been made, and ought to have been made, through the Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world.

That entire restoration from the wounds due to transgressions is effected by the perfect virtue and complete work of the Lord Jesus is by no means open to doubt. Just as the undefiled in paradise would have passed over to God free from all blame, so even now purified souls pass over to him with the same blamelessness. For by the aid of the Great Physician the pure in heart are so completely healed of their wounds that not the slightest scar remains in them. And this holds none the less in sins of the flesh than in the most grievous sins, such as those of the prophet David, for example, adultery, treachery, or homicide. For it is impossible to believe that God hates lawful conjugal relations more than treachery and adultery. Besides, if all the Law and the Prophets hang on the commandments of love, it is clear that the more one loves, the more blameless, sound, pure, and free from scars he must be. Truly he that loves purity, chastity, and celibacy more, the more shall he receive the celibate's reward. For it is love—not celibacy—that makes the best ground to bring forth fruit a hundred fold; though good ground bringeth forth thirty, and better ground sixty. We see Peter called to the apostleship in marriage, while Timothy, who was far below him in the fruit of the word of God, was called to discipleship in celibacy. But it is the preeminence of the Virgin Mother that designates for special primacy and unusual preeminence all those who —in the exercise of their priesthood after her—are led into the temple of the King; some perfect, others blameless, —blameless in proportion to their love. Married prelates, who love celibacy even more than celibates do, are held in higher honor than the latter, and receive the greater reward. Yet they do not gain the distinction of celibates, although they receive the greater reward for having loved celibacy more. For the one involves righteousness and purity of heart; the other, the inviolate sacrifice of

celibacy. In the former love is crowned; in the latter celibacy.

"He that giveth to a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward; and he that giveth to a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward." If this is carried to its logical conclusion, one ought to say: "He that giveth to an evangelist in the name of an evangelist shall receive an evangelist's reward; and he that giveth to a teacher in the name of a teacher shall receive a teacher's reward." Why so? Unless it is because, if one loves, respects, and esteems the gifts of God in another, that esteem, love, and respect will be counted to him for merit, as though he himself had been presented with that gift of God; for love alone is essential to every virtue. Hence he that loves another's righteousness with even greater respect and esteem than the one who has received it from the Lord, shall also receive a righteous man's reward more than the righteous man whom he loves. For oftentimes such a purposeful state of mind (*actus obiectalis*) is thereby induced that it is more acceptable in the sight of God than many formal acts (*actus formales*). Therefore one may so love another's righteousness that, even if there were no room for exercising righteousness, he that respected it in another would actually observe it with greater affection than the righteous man. And if this conclusion is true, and universally true, you will infer that even those who are not martyrs, and yet with full heart give to martyrs in the name of martyrs, shall receive the martyrs' reward. Thus is it with those who are not virgins, like Elizabeth, Queen of Hungary, who both before and after her marriage loved virginity more than many virgins and would have kept it inviolate, had not a great necessity forced her to do otherwise. And so I believe that she, who had given so much to virgins in the name of virgins, no less

than the virgins themselves received the virgins' great reward.

But this reasoning will be strengthened if it is founded on the merit and efficacy of the priesthood of Jesus, who is our propitiation, and not only purifies what is unclean, but restores it to all its former, original dignity. If the Father, being reconciled by his sacrifice, restores us perfectly, it is rash to set a limit both as to how much he restores and how much he leaves incompletely restored. And if he imputeth not iniquity, and if—in every other sin—it shall be as though it did not exist, why not in this too? For David—nay the Holy Spirit by the mouth of David—says, "Blessed is the man whose iniquities are covered, unto whom he imputeth not iniquity." A wound is not fully cured, if a scar of any sort remains as a remembrance of the injury. Hence if it be said that love of chastity must be crowned with its appropriate reward, then it follows that no gift should be made—least of all the unique gift of an aureole—, if the body has been defiled. According to this reasoning I would have to say that Peter's repentance was not to be followed by as perfect purity as the altogether innocent possess; for these have not sinned, while his denial of the Lord is an indisputable fact of the past, and it could not then be undone. On this assumption, however, the scales will not tip toward virginity, as they will be balanced, not upon the pivot of love, but upon a past action which is simply unchangeable. Jephthah's daughter, although she bewailed her virginity, would receive the maidens' crown, while in the case of many virgins, who have suffered violence in an enemy's incursion, the unrestrained lust of their pursuers must rob them of the crown of their piety.

But, however this may be, both sides are equally firm and fixed in the opinion that, on the one hand, Elizabeth of Hungary, who blessed virgins by her vows and desires,

should receive the virgins' reward, and yet on the other hand that virgins should have their own especial crown. For whether we wish it or not, if Mary had intercourse with Joseph, she could not have attained to the conspicuous glory of being supremely exalted, however pure in heart she might have been, and however much Abraham's marriage may be compared with John's celibacy. For it must needs be that only those who have such rectitude in action should have an especial title to glory.

But this apparent difference in those who urge their arguments on each side of the question is readily harmonized by the truth that is clearly to be seen within. For a certain aureole is bestowed as the reward both of virgins and of those that love virginity. Moreover this aureole is a certain joy and ardor of mind toward God, whereby one rejoices greatly, confesses and gives thanks for so great a gift of God. Hence the virgin rejoices, confesses and gives thanks, because she has been kept a virgin through God's assistance. Elizabeth, Queen of Hungary, and Magdalene rejoice, confess and give thanks because they have been kindled with the love of such great virginity and purity, and each one's rectitude in due measure is crowned by God with its title of honor. For the more each has received, the more he confesses and gives thanks. It is neither possible for Elizabeth to confess that her virginity was preserved nor for Jephthah's daughter that she favored celibacy. Nevertheless all alike shall have this reward, that all the faculties of the soul are to be enriched, so that all that is within us may bless the Lord and all our bones may praise his holy name. For love is diffused in our hearts through the gift of the Holy Spirit to us. He importunes for us, exercising his office even when we are not aware of it, so that what we ourselves have not received is counted to us in proportion as we have loved it in another. For our weakness in these

troublous times is such that we cannot actually perform all things.

When a man possesses pure, true, unadulterated, genuine gold, even if he reflects and knows that it was made out of lead or mud or even out of filth, he does it no injustice because of its former cheapness or worthlessness, but puts that out of mind in view of the real gold. And if perchance—as we see is the case in iron and bronze—so in the gold one substance is better than the other, but the latter being more easily tempered than the pure gold is transformed and in this process is indissolubly combined with it, he will love it, not only as much as the real gold, but even more. So also among the children of God's grace, those who have been raised and lifted from the earth and out of the filth, to whom—though they are of humbler origin—he has granted greater grace, these God, the Father, will raise to a more distinguished place in his kingdom. What loss therefore will he bring upon Peter, Paul and Magdalene, though they once were sinners, —now that they have been fully cleansed and not a single spot of their former baseness remains? This fear arises from man's foolishness, not from him who discerns all things most clearly. The degree of one's attainments determines the honor awarded to him. If that which once was now no longer exists, it is absolutely nothing, and therefore must not be weighed in the balances of judgment. That which is not in one's power incurs no guilt. We have at least some power over the future, but absolutely none over the past. And since it is entirely beyond the power of the will, who can justly impute it to us? If no existing traces of past sin defile the mind, no punishment remains for him who has been turned from it.

The Farrago

VI

Dr. Wessel Concerning Purgatory; What the Fire of Purgatory is, and its Nature; Concerning the State and Progress of Souls after this Life, etc.

DR. WESSEL CONCERNING PURGATORY; WHAT THE FIRE OF PURGATORY IS, AND ITS NATURE; CONCERNING THE STATE AND PROGRESS OF SOULS AFTER THIS LIFE, ETC.

But first concerning the two Commandments of Love; Twenty Propositions concerning the Power of the Pope and the Church.

1. All turning away from evil, all turning toward good, all justification, all spiritual union with God, depend on the two chief commandments.

2. Everything that depends tends to be accomplished by coming to perfection.

3. Therefore every law, every prophetic promise and precept depends for its fulfillment solely on the perfection of love.

4. So long as these two commandments are not perfectly fulfilled, God will not perfectly fulfil his promise concerning entrance into his kingdom.

5. All the prerogative power of the pope beyond and above other pastors in the Church is purely jurisdictional.

6. All jurisdictional, ecclesiastical power ought to be exercised in accordance with the decision of a wise man, and only as a truly wise man shall determine.

7. This obligation in regard to the power entrusted to supreme pontiffs does not make them infallible, so that they cannot err, or so that what they do must be for good.

8. No ecclesiastical power—whether of rank or jurisdiction—can arbitrarily make anyone fulfil perfectly these two commandments.

9. The jurisdictional power of the pope can exercise its function in warning, teaching, influencing, directing, edifying by word and example, and also in the administration of the sacraments.

10. But in the hearts of those that are edified, the pope exercises no rights of power or authority for their edification; therefore they are edified within, simply because God wills it.

11. God who appoints the pope over his household does not require of him that he should convert and inspire the hearts of his subjects, but that he should faithfully cooperate with them to this end.

12. Once when Paul wished to preach the gospel, the spirit of Jesus did not permit it.

13. Jurisdictional power extends only over those matters in which man is to be directed by man.

14. God has reserved for himself the right to decide matters which are directly conducted between God and man.

15. He that cannot know what takes place within a man (since this is not open to any outward observation), ought not to pass judgment on him.

16. No mortal man can determine how much a person's eye must be cleansed or how pure he must be to be found worthy to see God.

17. The pope cannot judge others in matters which he can neither determine nor know in regard to himself.

18. If he, who neither can nor should judge, insists on judging, he sins and errs, with the result that the judgment is null and void, since it is a sentence pronounced by one who has no right to judge.

19. Every act that results from a judgment that is absolutely null and void is also as nothing.

20. Plenary remission requires that judgment be passed in advance with regard to the perfection and purity of another's eye. Hence the remission is efficacious only in so far as the decision that preceded it conforms to the truth.

Thirteen Propositions concerning the Power of the Pope and the Subject of Indulgences; concerning the Remission of Guilt and Punishments;—sent to Master Jacob Hoeck, Dean of Naeldwick.

1. The pope has no more power to relax punishment than to forgive sins.

2. A man is free from punishment only as he is devoid of sin.

3. Every sin, however venial, because of its nature is linked by eternal laws with its proper punishment on account of inherent imperfection, separation, unlikeness, baseness, rejection, shame, and denial of fruition.

4. Many who have truly confessed their contrition and have fulfilled the conditions required for an indulgence, are mere babes in Christ, as yet by no means conformed to Christ, having need of much travail before Christ be formed in them.

5. The pope cannot—by the exercise of arbitrary power—form Christ perfectly in babes and imperfect disciples.

6. The pope cannot dispose of that which exists in part, he cannot bring about that which is perfect, he cannot make a wayfarer attain, he cannot ordain that a wayfarer shall be perfect, even at the end of the way.

7. The pope has no more power over the merit of Christ's sufferings than over baptism in the Holy Spirit.

8. No bride shall enter that divine marriage chamber without being perfectly cleansed from all menses, al-

together fair, immaculate, and perfectly adorned according to the judgment of a Solomon.

9. The stains of menses are nothing but imperfect affections.

10. Unless one loves perfectly, he can in no wise rejoice in God.

11. Every imperfect love is excluded from perfect fruition.

12. To one that loves, all exclusion is punishment.

13. The pope cannot remove penal exclusions or the great gulf fixed between imperfect and perfect love.

Thirty-two Propositions by Dr. Wessel concerning the Treasure of the Church, and Participation therein; through whom, to whom, and how this Treasure is to be dispensed; and concerning the Nature of Purgatory.

1. The purpose of participation in the heavenly Jerusalem consists in the sharing of it with others.

2. Complete participation with others involves perfect love.

3. He who rejoices truly and perfectly in the progress and perfection of all them that fear God, who loves and glorifies his Father who is in heaven,—he shares fully with all them that fear God.

4. One's participation in the heavenly Jerusalem is always commensurate with his desire for it.

5. In so far as the pope is able to excite this desire by his faithful ministry, he can make men share with all them that fear God.

6. He who cannot exercise authority over another's desire cannot decide as to his participation.

7. Participation for the purpose of sharing with others is the participation, partly of blessedness and partly of sanctification.

8. The participation of sanctification is partly actual (*actualis*) and partly habitual (*habitualis*).

9. In the Jerusalem above, which is our mother, participation is always "actual" on the part of those who love nothing but God, or who love only on God's account.

10. "Actual" participation is partly perfect, partly imperfect.

11. Perfect participation does not occur unless the two chief commandments have been fulfilled.

12. No one participates "actually" with all them that fear God, unless he knows, esteems, and desires "actually" every blessing for them that fear God, and hence "actually" glorifies God, his Father in heaven.

13. "To them that love God all things work together for good."

14. The measure of one's love determines the measure of this working together for his good, and of his participation for the purpose of sharing with others, and of his participation with them that fear God; if little, but little; if much, much; if "habitually, habitually."

15. If the measure of participation depends upon the measure of love, he who alone can inspire love is the only one who can efficaciously determine that participation.

16. All are agreed that—next to God and our Saviour—it is the will of the faithful rather than the power of the pope that determines how much one shall share with all them that fear God.

17. To all that believe in the name of the only begotten Son of God the power has been given to become the sons of God; therefore heirs of God; and therefore participants.

18. The pope cannot make the heirs of God joint-heirs with Christ, since it would be no advance in their condition (*habitus*); for they are already joint-heirs.

19. He does not make them share in the treasures of the Church; but whether he wills it or not, the faithful

disciple participates in them in accordance with the measure of the first commandment.

20. He that either "habitually" or "actually" does not yet wisely esteem and desire the treasure of the Church, does not yet share in it; for he shares in it only as much as he esteems it.

21. The treasure of the Church, the heavenly kingdom, marriage enjoyment, the holy priesthood, are really the same, so that one cannot exist without the rest.

22. No faithful soul shall hear that marriage call, "Come, my bride, come; thou shalt be crowned," unless those things precede which make her worthy of this call; so that in the judgment of a true Solomon she is first altogether beautiful and perfect.

23. Only he who betroths judges his bride to be altogether fair and beautiful, and calls to her.

24. He who judges that either he himself or his neighbor has been worthily prepared for bridal love deceives himself and the truth is not in him.

25. Neither the authority of the prelates nor the integrity of the sacraments renders a man in this life devoid of sin.

26. Unless one can declare a man devoid of sin, he cannot decree that he is exempt from punishment.

27. The weightiest affliction for a loving soul is the deferment of his holy desires, and this the pope neither can nor should take away.

28. For souls that love imperfectly, it is natural, just and right that there should be this purgatory; that those who love as brides, and yet imperfectly, should be excluded from the marriage chamber of the bridegroom.

29. Purgatory—to be truly purgatorial—ought to cleanse impurity.

30. Nothing cleanses love that is not pure as does burning, deferred, thirsting love, that is set on fire of

itself, just as wisdom is clarified by reflection. For it shall be a fire that shall prove the works of each man.

31. Certain sins are forgiven after this life; therefore love is perfected after this life.

32. I do not dispute the claim that there are other painful punishments by fire; but I deny that they are principally purgatorial punishments.

What the Fire of Purgatory is.

The fire of purgatory is a fire that does not torment, but rather cleanses the inward man of the impurity which accompanies him even when released from the flesh. A fire, I say, that devours the filth, i. e. his sins; for the inward man can have no other stains. According to the Apostle, these stains are tried by the fire of intellectual discipline, when it discerns and, kindled with fiery zeal, burns up the wood, hay and stubble, until nothing remains of that which was built upon the one, true, and only firm foundation, Jesus Christ, except silver, gold and costly stones; in order that "the whole building fitly framed together may grow into a holy temple in the Lord." Therefore we must grow into a temple by means of the same holy fire, by which we must be purified from evil habits and affections. This is not so much the opinion of Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, XXI. 26, as the opinion of the Apostle Paul, I Cor. III. 11–13; which so strongly confirms my conviction, that though an angel from heaven should announce anything other than that which we have received, he ought not to be believed. For I think the opinions of the Fathers, in so far as they seem to differ from mine, were expressed figuratively rather than literally. Now the Apostle evidently uses all these words figuratively when he says: "Wood, hay, stubble, silver, gold, costly stones, fire, foundation," and "built upon." For these—taken

collectively—are figurative and metaphorical. He uses only two words that explain the metaphor, viz. "Christ" and "will prove." Through these two words we may transfer the entire metaphor of physical things to the spiritual intelligence of the inward man. Here there is no wood, hay, or stubble; nor silver nor gold, etc. But Christ is the foundation; the image and likeness of Christ, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing is the structure that is built upon it; and unless the zeal of burning love consumes the spot and wrinkle of lukewarmness, that structure that has been begun never grows into a temple fit for God to dwell in.

From the foregoing I think you will easily gather my view and will readily contrast it with popular opinion and the talk of the unstable and credulous crowd.

Forty-six Propositions by the same Dr. Wessel, or Basil, of Frisia, concerning Purgatory and the State of Souls after this Life.

Certain persons have been pleased to demand of me my promised opinion concerning the cleansing of souls that have been released from the body, and concerning purgatory. And behold! of my own accord, I now fulfil my promise to the best of my ability, protesting that, in this my opinion, I wish to affirm nothing but what is in agreement with Holy Writ. Moreover, if it differs anywhere from the Holy Scriptures, when I am convinced of it, I will quickly recall it. This being my constant wish, I shall not err more culpably than did St. Jerome on the subject of Peter and Paul in Galatians. For an error that is not stubbornly held is venial. In the meantime my opinion is as follows:

1. When it is said that man was made in the image and likeness of God, I understand that this applies only to the inward man.

2. In the inward man the image and likeness of God is the same as in the inward angel.

3. Just as there is an inward and outward man, so there is an inward and outward angel.

4. And the end of both is the same, viz. the image and likeness of God.

5. The image of God, the likeness of God, is not perfected unless perfect union is attained, so that the soul holding fast to its prototype, the living God, becomes one in spirit with him.

6. For men the way to this end differs from that for angels; differs, I say, in the point of acceleration and delay.

7. For angels the divine light, like unto lightning, has shone, gleamed and burned, so that they could suddenly attain that union of spirit for which they were made. But not so for men under the common law.

8. The first human beings, Adam and Eve, who were placed in paradise, were far removed from the union of the angels.

9. It was necessary for them to attain it by progressive steps, clinging to and loving God.

10. In order that our first parents might of necessity hasten to this end they had—written in their hearts—the first commandment, on which hang all the Law and the Prophets.

11. They were as far removed from the image and likeness of God as they were unable to keep this commandment.

12. I do not believe that if Magdalene, loving the Lord Jesus as she did, had received a commandment from him not to taste of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, as Eve and Adam did from the Lord God, she could have been enticed to disobey the command by any subtlety of the serpent.

13. To the inward man his separation, goal, insuf-

ficiency, insignificance, poverty, weakness and impurity are all one and the same thing.

14. Our first parents in paradise were more insufficient for and farther removed from the divine likeness and the truly spiritual union in their original righteousness than Magdalene was, when under the cross.

15. The righteousness imparted unto Magdalene was stronger than was the original righteousness in Adam and Eve. This is clear from proposition 12.

16. Hence the original righteousness of our first parents in paradise was the weaker.

17. To the inward man to draw near, to be made like, to grow, to be enriched, to be strengthened, to be cleansed, are the same. This is clear from proposition 13.

18. Even as our first parents in paradise had need of approach, of strength, growth, enrichment and conformance, they had also the need of purification. This is evident from proposition 16.

19. If the place for this purification is sought, paradise must have been purgatory for them.

20. If the manner and form of their purification is sought, it must have been obedience to the warning of the angels.

21. It is no more unbefitting for a man, who has become imperfect, to be purified by an angel, who is already blessed, than for a blessed lower angel through hierarchic action to be purified by a higher.

22. If a blessed angel is purified, illumined and perfected by hierarchic action, this process must necessarily be assigned to different parts of the soul.

23. Therefore, purification must be assigned to the reason—through the sapient knowledge of God; illumination to the intellect—through sublime glorification of God; perfection to the will—through blessed enjoyment of God.

24. "Every branch that beareth fruit, the Father cleanseth, that it may bear more fruit."

25. The Father cooperates with the angels that cleanse; the Word, the Life and glorifying Light cooperate with the angels that illumine; and cooperating with the angels that perfect and inspire is that flaming and eternal love and charity, most worthy of God who loves, and of God, the beloved, the Holy Spirit.

26. The Greeks think that all souls when released from the body pass forthwith to the blessed purity of the holy angels without any intervening, holy, lingering purification.

27. The Latins hold that souls released by the death that is precious in the sight of the Lord are cleansed by a certain lingering, holy purification, which is not yet blessed. There is a difference however among the Latins in regard to the purification,—both as to its form, its place, and its end. Certain of them mete out and decree a torment that may be felt, as a result of the guilt of the sin that has been forgiven. Others, however, agreeing with Augustine in his sermon, *De Verbis Domini*, are of the opinion that that fire—as is fitting for the inward man—will be merely intellectual in its discipline.

28. The latter are strongly supported by the word of the Apostle, when he says, "The fire itself shall prove each man's work, of what sort it is."

29. Hence they say that fire shall be of such a nature that it can discern between the foundation and the things that are built thereon, the wood, hay, or stubble, and that it can not only reject whatever is badly built upon it, but can set it afire, so that it shall burn; and that it can prove the good works, and save them together with the foundation.

30. The Lord Jesus directs men in this life to keep their lamps burning in their hands, and to wait until the

Son of man shall come and knock. And St. Peter in his canonical epistle, after speaking of the light of a lamp shining in a dark place, mentions two changes or alterations in it, viz. the rising day star and the dawning day.

31. By the rising day star I understand him to mean the Son of man, when he comes and knocks, shining far beyond the light of a lamp, manifesting his marvelous power among men by doing the works which none other can do, so that those, who then do not open straightway, shall not have any excuse for their sin.

32. But they that wait with their loins girded about, and open straightway to him,—these, seeing the Christ of the Lord, receive him in their arms and bless him, speaking and praying in peace, and giving thanks in accordance with the word of the Lord; because their eyes have seen the salvation of God which was prepared before the face of all peoples.

33. There, their prayer is heard and their death is made precious in the sight of the Lord, as though they were already saints and had been saved from their sins.

34. Those who love the Lord Jesus are saved, before they are released from the body,—and that in the light of the rising day star.

35. After the light of the rising day star St. Peter puts the approaching day. Since however the sun has not risen yet, I believe with the Latins that this is that lingering progress, by which souls released from their bodies are cleansed and advance to that degree of holy love, which is due to each one for his place in the temple, for his mansion in the Father's house.

36. It is clearly asserted in the Song of Solomon that the soul is as a beautiful dove, coming up from the wilderness, altogether fair, undefiled from head to foot, most pleasant for delights.

37. Such graces do not belong to this life; for here,

"in many things we all stumble"; "and if we say that we have no sin, the truth is not in us." But far be it from a bridegroom that a lie should be found in his mouth.

38. Hence these graces of a true bride, which are included in the true and truth-telling commendation of the bridegroom, are fitting for the bride in the after-life. But at the time when the bridegroom bestows these praises upon the bride, she is still a wayfarer, not yet seeing the rising of the sun or attaining to the beatific vision.

39. She pants to see the bridegroom, but sees him not, when she says: "I sought him, but I found him not; I called him, but he gave me no answer."

40. I believe that these ardent desires are the holier works of the bride which she does after the death that is precious in the sight of the Lord, toward the dawning day, before the rising of the blessed sun.

41. I believe that she is purified in this light after the death that is precious in the sight of the Lord, and that the purgatorial place of this purification is paradise.

42. All who have died by the death that is precious in the sight of the Lord have been established in grace. Therefore they are far holier and purer than Adam and Eve in paradise.

43. The thief on the cross received paradise as his purgatory, because for the time being he was still a wayfarer.

44. I do not believe that the thief expired in a purer state than holy men generally, for whom the holy have prayed from the founding of the early Church.

45. These things seem to me to prove that purgatory is spiritual rather than penal.

46. But if this is proved, it follows that the examples of all the dialogues and visions of illustrious men must be interpreted and accepted metaphorically rather than historically. But of these, more elsewhere.

In regard to purgatory Dr. Wessel also says that physical punishments are not *per se* purgatorial. Just as in blindness, if you should apply ten thousand eye salves, there is no cleansing whatever, unless the vision is restored; so nothing *per se* but the increasing love of God cleanses the impurity of the departing soul.

The more a penitent loves, the more of a punishment is his waiting. And this is not inflicted by dispensation, but is in the nature of things. Hence neither pope nor prelate can remove it. And if these punishments—such as fearing God, waiting for him, hungering and thirsting after righteousness, mourning, groaning, longing, and failing to reach the halls of the Lord,—if, I say, these punishments are most efficacious unto purification, why is it necessary to seek others, since the others are useless without these?

For the dead make progress in more assured faith, in more confident hope, in more fervent love, having cast off the frail body, so that they may run the race that is set before them more swiftly, hastening with great strides toward perfection. Paul thinks that these—and even more blessed things than these—are to be believed concerning the dead, when he says, "We would not have you ignorant concerning them that fall asleep, that ye sorrow not"; as if he said, "If ye but knew their condition ye would not sorrow." Hence they are in such a state, that if we knew it, we would rejoice. Therefore in a state,—not wretched, not under the rod of a lictor, nor in the fire prepared for the devil and his angels,—but under the discipline of the Father, who instructs them and rejoices in their daily progress. And they on their part in their eager advance, their burning hope, their thirsting desire, consider themselves unworthy because they do not glow more with love.

As for what certain men say concerning merit and the

means of obtaining merit, viz. that each one of us is followed by his own works, and that in the next life there is no further opportunity to obtain merit,—this is to be understood as applying to the first movement of the soul, i. e. its regeneration, quickening into life from corruption; but by no means with regard to the growth or correction of the soul's perversion. For there, they are not born again from death unto life, but they truly grow out of the imperfect unto the perfect, and are cleansed from the impurity of their venial affections. See Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, Book XXI, Chapter 26, and Gregory, *In Moralibus*. See also William of Paris, *De Universo Corporali*, Book I, where, at considerable length, he holds that the souls of the dead are also cleansed from their sins and uncleanness, and out of their imperfections are made perfect. For in accordance with the opinion of the Apostle, "He who began a good work in you will perfect it until the day of Jesus Christ." Phil. I. 6.

When the Apostle says that each one shall receive according to what he hath done in the flesh, he does not say "only in the flesh," to the exclusion of what may be done elsewhere. Such sins as are confessed are forgiven in the future life. Hence there shall be sins there, not done in the flesh, for which one shall receive punishment.

That fire, which is to prove each man's work, will not be really penal; for if that were the case, the fire would not relate to the character of each man's work. As it is however it will be such as to prove and judge each man's work. Hence that fire shall not be corporeal. For Paul speaks of it as a fire that shall know how to discern, approve or condemn the inward differences of our intellect and will. Thus the things which that fire shall burn are neither corporeal nor combustible, although the Apostle, using words that apply to corporeal things, builds hay, stubble, wood, silver, gold, costly stones upon that one

foundation. Who is so absurd as to believe that any one of the sons of God is building corporeal hay, stubble, or wood, as his cornerstone, upon the foundation of a spiritual building? Nay all holy men, who have built silver, gold and costly stones upon that foundation have despised all silver, gold and costly stones; hence they cannot bring of such things to build thereon. It is altogether out of place for such things to be built upon such a foundation. Therefore I think that men are no less absurd and foolish in thinking that the fire that proves and judges such things is corporeal.

What then is that fire? Surely it is that consuming fire, which is God, burning and consuming the reins and purifying the gold until all its tin and lead flows away, trying the silver and cleansing it from all dross,—God who searcheth the heart and the reins. Therefore that fire of purgatory is the same as the foundation that has been laid. If those among us, who grant indulgences, would give careful heed to this fire and these combustible things, they would not be so rash in promising plenary remission and every sort of impunity after death. For they would know that the testing of souls by that fire is necessary, even as after unavoidable death comes the just judgment. But this judgment shall be in the fire that shall prove of what sort each man's work shall be. Hence unless the pope—through indulgences—can make one's work such that it shall suffer no loss, he will not be able to pass him without purification into the place where nothing unclean shall enter. For by the testimony of Paul—nay of the Holy Spirit through Paul—the works of most men are such that they shall suffer some loss in the proving of that fire, even though they are indeed holy men; for the soul "shall be saved: yet so as through fire." If anyone can stop that fire from its work, if anyone can stop the righteous Judge—nay righteousness itself—from re-

quiting and judging, only then will he be able to stop the purification of the unclean.

A consuming fire is our God, who made man after his own image, who sent fire into the earth and willed that it should burn and consume all unsightliness from his image by the fervor of love. Therefore every work of man that is burned and consumed by this fire is truly lost to him. Hence this is truly a purifying fire *per se*, while material fire may purify, but only *per accidens*. Lust, before it conceives, is truly the gate—though still closed—of death and hell; when however through folly it has conceived, it opens the heart to death. So conscience is indeed the door of the kingdom, but it is shut as long as the truth of the gospel is not accepted. Hence the truth of the gospel is a vital key of the kingdom, just as folly is a key of death. Thus truth and falsehood are keys of salvation and perdition, which are operated through him, by whom the sacrament is administered and the antidote does its work.

The fire, which is awaited by saintly souls departing hence, whereby they shall suffer the loss of their works according to the deeds done in the flesh,—this fire the holy Fathers described as "purgatorial," not "satisfactive." But those of a later period, who could not submit purification to the decision of prelates, resorted to the term "satisfaction," although in reality no satisfaction is required, where there is entire purity of heart. For righteousness finds no cause of offense at all in a righteous man. But what has transpired in the past is no longer in one's power and has been laid at rest in the satisfaction rendered by the death of the great Priest, the full fruit of which is bestowed upon those who cleave blamelessly to Christ,—a transaction in which only the will of the highest and greatest pontiff can lawfully intervene.

Let us now consider the point that most of the saints

regard the fire as penal and material: In the first place, I think that this was brought about by God's will in the interests of piety and because of its usefulness to the multitude. In the second place, I am of the opinion that they did not assert it falsely, but figuratively, just as there are many things even in canonical Scripture that have been so handed down to us in parable that the common crowd regard them as material,—such as brightness, light, clearness, etc. In the third place, though I believe that the fire of purgatory is not primarily material, yet I think it is principally a purifying fire, because—*per se* and by its own holy increase—it purifies; for the more it grows, the more it assimilates and unites one to God. Hence, I say, to be made like God and to be united to him through love is to be purified. And I call a soul impure, if it does not love perfectly. To grow in love, this indeed is to be purified. But if penal suffering were *per se* and essentially purification, it would immediately follow that the greater the torment, the greater would be the purification. And so Lucifer, the most malignant of demons, would be the more pure, because the more tormented. But if he is being purified more and more, he is approaching more and more toward purity; and therefore he is now purer and cleaner than at the very beginning of his downfall. Yet his pride is always vaunting itself.

Those who depart from this life still imperfect need true purification and increasing love, because they depart hence with evil habits and affections. See Augustine *De Civitate Dei*, Book XXI, Chapter 21; also William of Paris, *De Universo Corporali*, Part 1, Chapter 100. Therefore they need a purification that purifies *per se* and essentially. But since they departed hence in grace, they were not "put to shame when they spoke with their enemies in the gate." And, inasmuch as they were confirmed by death so that they could not fall from grace, truly precious in

the sight of the Lord was the death of these saints. For they died in the Lord, more blessed in the way of God than Adam and Eve; therefore with greater love, and more in the grace of God than they. But if they, surrounded with the blessed happiness of paradise, were able to be cleansed as they needed to be from their imperfect love, why could not the thief, descending from the cross, have been cleansed of what remained of his imperfection in paradise under the Lord Jesus, our teacher, guide, and donor, our sacrifice, victim, burnt offering, incense, manna, our continual drink offering? And if he could, why could not all, who have died blessed in the Lord by the death that is precious to him, be cleansed with equal blessedness of what remains of their imperfection? Nevertheless it is not without reason or by an unwilling trope that Augustine, that most distinguished of teachers, in Sermon 112, *De Verbis Domini*, designates this state by the metaphor of fire, when in words partly figurative, partly literal, and so in part suited to either, he says that passing through fiery torrents of intellectual discipline,—this is purification.

Concerning the Happy State of Souls in Purgatory.

They have been led forth from the prison of their captivity, delivered from the body of death, freed from the flesh of sin, educated out of the wants of earthly frailty, rescued from the snares of the way-layer, restored to alacrity of spirit, heeding the Law and the word of the Lawgiver, not deaf hearers, but girded up to run the way of God's commandments, more prompt in his vineyard, and therefore more eagerly singing the songs of his statutes in the house of their pilgrimage. Yet, since the commandment there is exceeding broad, they themselves according to their mental capacity are grieved on account

of the deferment of their desires. But inasmuch as this grief causes them to burn with the fervor of love, even this delay is desired by them. Christ is a threefold example of righteousness: 1st, of toilsome righteousness in exile,—and this is strength, through achievement; 2nd, of happy and increasing righteousness in paradise,—this is holiness; 3rd, of blessed righteousness in the homeland,—this is blessedness.

The longings of deferred love shall grieve the soul, and so grieve it, that the love that is kindled shall increase to perfect ardor, so that no creature can separate it from the love of God which is in Christ,—an ardor as strong as death, as lasting as hell, nay stronger than both. As yet there is little love, because the soul still has some regard for itself, when it is grieved on account of death or hell. For with love God alone is all in all, and so long as he is not all in all, love is not pure. Therefore it must be purified of the old leaven, so that it can keep the feast with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth. But nothing purifies love but the increase of love. Hence, however great the torment may be, there is no purification unless love be increased. The most blessed and holy Lord Jesus endured a thousand torments and yet was in no wise purified thereby. Lucifer will endure eternal torments, but he will in no wise be purified. Torment therefore does not purify, save incidentally (*per accidens*). Nothing purifies *per se* except the increasing love of Christ and God.

Now if Peter in the beginning of his second canonical epistle promised to give diligence that at every time after his decease the faithful might call to remembrance the welfare of the dead there—and without doubt he truthfully fulfilled that promise,—how do we think the Lord Jesus is employed, who promised to be with us even unto the end of the world? For was he not given as an evangelist

to those to whom he was given as a mediator, and did he not thereby become a sun for every created spirit, whether wretched, happy, or indifferent. And because he possesses power in himself, he illumines those who are in the flesh whenever he wills, and as much as he wills, and of his own authority now grants to them the right to see God. But to those that are released from the flesh he shines forthwith, with nothing intervening between him and them. And into those who receive the light with good will he enters, and there he makes his abode, never to depart. But since the Latin Church maintains that there is a deferment of the blessed state, which it calls purgatory, and the apostles handed down baptism for the dead, it is reasonable to consider to what extent that sun possesses authority over godly souls that are released from the body, and in what manner it shines. For evidently, if they are turned toward him, they love him; and if they are deferred, they are grieved at the loss of blessed enjoyment. For they would wish to please him whom they love, as much as they love him. And this longing causes them to burn more ardently than lovers in the flesh ever do. Hence this longing is that fire which proves and rejects all the hay, wood and stubble, that has been unprofitably built upon the foundation of faithful love. And to whatever extent these things are because of their fervent longing rejected, to that extent do their works burn, to that extent they suffer loss, to that extent they are purified.

Peter received no pastoral commission from Christ concerning those things to which a pagan is just as much entitled as a Christian. Nor did he receive any pastoral commission with regard to those things outside of the state of grace and love to which a believer is not entitled. Therefore he received authoritative commission only with regard to those matters in which the believer can and

should share faithfully with the faithful, i. e. in accordance with the Christian's mode of living. If he shows that he is careful and anxious about these matters, he is a faithful servant. And if he aids those under his charge—although this improvement does not depend upon his aid,—he is a useful servant. For in accordance with the commandment of God who commends him, he ought to wish that this improvement depended on his aid; but that he does aid, is by the grace of him that giveth the increase, etc.

Why is this, if it be not that we may understand that whatever power a faithful and wise servant of God possesses over the flock entrusted to him in imparting, edifying, aiding, directing, and carefully and usefully governing it has relation to the outward man? For the inward man, who was created in the image of God, is not man, so long as he is dead. And he is dead so long as he does not breathe with that life which exists through love. For in speaking of gifts other than life through love, the Apostle always concludes by saying, "I am nothing"; he likewise says, "I am dead." Even as the inward man is the only image of God, being made after the likeness of God, so he was created by God alone, and has been made subject to no other authority. This is precisely what Ambrose meant when he said that a priest indeed exercises ministry, but that he does not in relation to the inward man exercise any authority as regards piety. And as this inward man is renewed from day to day, he is purified from day to day, until Christ shall be formed in him.

But Peter did not receive this power of cleansing, renewing, forming, and transforming, in his pastoral commission. Hence he received no pastoral commission in those things, which a man cannot obtain except after purification and by means of it,—things whose nature is

such that, Christ being formed in us, we run to God with a pure heart, we are admitted to see him, we rush into his loving embrace, and rise to the kiss, not only of harmonious wills, but of the same will in all things,—not being regarded less worthy because of some blemish or deformity and therefore shut out from the marriage chamber of God. And, since no one can obtain entrance to this chamber unless he is pure in heart and created after God's likeness —a perfect man unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ, it follows that he, who cannot bestow this purity and renewal, this transformation, perfection and fullness, cannot on his own authority remove the deferment of that entrance, or remit blemishes that hinder it. What then Peter's successors accomplish through plenary remission I do not see, although many Schoolmen talk of their power of relaxing punishment. Who indeed can deny that it is punishment for one who so loves, if he be excluded as unworthy and his deferred longings grieve his soul,—and the more ardent they are the more they grieve him? On the other hand, if he knows that he is being deferred because he is unworthy, in proportion to the zeal which we believe he kindles within himself, he by reason of that very delay and exclusion is burned and consumed with double the fire. And this doubly strong fire is truly the purgatory of the inward man, cleansing the heart until with a pure heart he shall see God. And until this is accomplished, it will cause him to burn more fiercely than any corporeal fire that can consume the body since this fire proceeds from the more glowing ardor of his passionate desire. If Peter or if Paul wished to remove this fire by means of indulgences, he would be exceedingly harsh; for he would take away all the splendor of the soul's most brilliant and gratifying achievement, as well as the pleasure of the recipient. For I think that a draught from that most pure and limpid fountain will be sweetest,

when it is presented most graciously to an exceedingly thirsty man. On the other hand, if it be offered to any who are careless and indifferent,—such as are most of those who indeed confess and are contrite and who depend on the grace of the ordinance,—it will be offered unworthily, so long as they are not pure and do not burn with perfect love. For who of us will be able to live in the midst of everlasting fires,—we who are still flesh so long as love of the flesh ensnares us and keeps us away from God, if not opposed to him? What does the word purgatory mean but purification, i. e. action directed toward purity? Moreover "depuration" is the casting aside of what is impure, an utter cleansing. Hence everyone that needs to be purified has within himself something impure and unclean; and this remains after this life, even in righteous men.

No one who is impure in heart shall see God, so long as that impurity of heart remains. Many who have truly confessed, and are savingly contrite, and live in grace and love, are still impure in heart. Hence when such persons die with this impurity of heart, they shall not see God immediately. This syllogism has some force in the matter of indulgences, but more in the efficacy of the sacraments, especially that of baptism, which—as all admit —bestows plenary remission. For it is not possible for two truths to be mutually contradictory. Both must be sound at the same time, if they are theological verities. Now it is true that no one, however much he may be a fellow citizen of the saints and one of God's household, will be admitted to behold that blessed vision of the King of Jerusalem in his splendor, so long as he has anything impure in him. For nothing impure shall enter that city, which is illuminated, not by the light of a lamp or the moon or the sun, but where, in place of the sun, the Lord

lightens the eyes of the mind. It is likewise true that baptism and the sacrament of penance take away all sin,—and that too entirely. A like admission must be made in regard to the sacrament of penance. For scantier provision has not been made for the sons of grace than for the sons of wrath. But this truth is to be accepted as dealing with those sins which one has committed before baptism and before penance. For since those sins are past and no longer in his power, if he believes in God and respects and holds fast to him as his great priest and sacrifice, they are altogether cleansed away by faith. If, however, some impurity is intermingled with the cleansing,—since this is in his power and is his fault,— it is not the result of any defect in the sacrament that he rises from baptism, alive and yet not pure;—even if he be baptized by Peter or Paul. Paul indicates this clearly enough by the differences in those that are built truly and savingly upon the true foundation, which is Christ Jesus, and who nevertheless build thereon, — some with hay, stubble, or wood; others, better with silver; others, best even with costly stones that cannot be injured at all by fire. Yet the fire shall prove the work of all these, of what sort it is. If therefore neither the sacrament of penance nor baptism can cleanse according to the law of burning justification, nor present grace together with a great desire for perfect love, nor even the entrance and presence of the Holy Spirit, unless, in addition to this, one's very desire is perfectly pure, I do not see upon what the high pontiff relies, in indiscriminately promising immunity from this fire and impunity for uncleanness to so great a multitude, etc. Especially since this very fire (although possibly he may have some other fire subservient to himself) is for the more part love, and most of all the Holy Spirit.

Baptism regenerates a believer from death to life and, whether he be penitent or impenitent, washes and cleanses him from all past sins, so that they are not imputed to him for guilt or punishment. Hence, just as in baptism, when God cleanses a man from guilt, he does not impute it to him for punishment; so likewise in repentance, to whatever extent God cleanses a man from guilt, to that extent he exempts him from punishment. For no matter how many of an impenitent man's past sins may be forgiven in baptism, if in spite of it, his past sins are so pleasing that he wishes to return to them when opportunity is given, he would not be cleansed, even if he were baptized by Peter himself. And if they are not pleasing enough for him to repeat them, and yet please him in some degree, though venially, to this extent his baptism is impure, although he is cleansed with regard to the rest. So also in confession and in contrition, he is cleansed in so far as no impurity whatever is intermingled with the repentance. Hence if a perfectly pure person repents, he obtains absolute impunity for all past sins, so that when that fire shall prove his work, if it finds nothing to burn, he shall pass on without any loss. And except God, no one can judge in regard to this purity; neither the pope, nor the entire Church. Hence neither pope nor council can issue indulgences of impunity from that final fire; they have no authority for judgment, where they cannot discern. And hence the proof that a ministrant administers a sacrament, but does not guarantee its gracious effect; for he cannot discern the mind of the recipient. Therefore the effect of the sacraments is in the hands of Him who knows the hearts of the recipients. And it is He — not the ministrant — that gives absolution from sins. And to whatever extent He absolves from sin, to that extent He absolves from punishment.

The Opinion of Doctor Wessel that Souls existing in Purgatory make Progress in the Next Life, drawn from the Words of the Apostle Peter; concerning Christ's Preaching of the Gospel and Knocking after his Death; together with Some Propositions drawn from the Same Text.

That many things concerning the state of the soul after the death of the flesh are indefinite or unknown to theologians in this world is easily proven by the word at the end of the 3rd chapter of the 1st canonical epistle of Peter, which reads: "Because Christ died once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God: being put to death in the flesh, and made alive in the spirit; in which also he went in the spirit and preached unto them that were in prison, that aforetime were disobedient, when the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing." Equally convincing is the word that follows in the beginning of the 4th chapter of this epistle to the same purport: "Who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the living and the dead. For unto this end was the gospel preached even to the dead, that they might be judged, being indeed dead according to men in the flesh, but alive according to God in the spirit." If the last statement be compared with the first (for all the words of Sacred Scripture, if properly understood, ought to show themselves to be in mutual agreement), they will strongly confirm this thought, i. e. Christ, having died for our sins, the righteous for the unrighteous, being put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit, went in the spirit and preached unto them that were in prison, that aforetime were disobedient; and the same Christ,—for it is Christ that is ready to judge the living and the dead,—the same Christ, I say, preached the gospel to the dead, since he went in the spirit and preached. For he preaches the gospel always that men may be judged,

i. e. that they may either believe and be saved, or disbelieving so great an evangelist may be condemned. He preaches even to the dead in prison; for it is expressly added in the text, "being indeed dead according to men in the flesh, but alive according to God in the spirit."

Here however a certain difficulty arises which militates against this idea and my opinion. For the Latin text reads, "that he might bring us to God, who have been put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit." If this were right, it would involve a slight conflict with the former idea. But the Greek text makes the above mentioned idea clearer, because in the Greek the two participles are put in the nominative singular, *θανατωθείς, ζωοποιηθείς*, not in the accusative plural, *θανατωθέντας*, etc. It is even made clear in the Latin text; for the relative *quo*, which follows, refers to the spirit of Christ, and not to the spirit of those that were made alive; for he came not in their spirit, but in his own.

If therefore Christ, having died in the flesh and having been made alive in the spirit, preached as an evangelist to them that were in prison (who were indeed dead in the flesh, but alive in the spirit), that aforetime were disobedient, and yet were waiting for the longsuffering of God, one must admit that they—being dead in the flesh, but alive in the spirit—had indeed believed to some degree, for "without faith it is impossible to please God." But their faith was neither complete nor clear; for otherwise, why should so great an evangelist preach to them? One must also admit that the gospel, which was preached by so great an evangelist revealed unto them many mysteries,—of which it is not given to man to speak.

Indeed it would seem truly humane on our part to believe that—just as there were many thousands in Nineveh that could not discern between their right hand and their left,—so in the great multitude of all who perished

in the flood there were some, who did not hear the preaching of Noah, or to whom he could not have even come; but that when these perished, they were converted to the Lord through the salutary encouragement of the holy angels, and that they were taught and admonished in regard to essential truths by these same angels. For the ray of God's most broad and secret compassion is exceedingly bright, and in his word concerning the Ninevites he revealed judgments to Jonah that were very different from the Prophet's ideas. Nor is this view of mine refuted by the word of the blessed Peter, that "eight souls in the ark were saved through water." For that salvation was merely of the body, being contrasted with the loss of the bodies of the rest that perished. And this is self-evident. For among those eight souls is reckoned Ham (who scoffed at his father), the father of Canaan, who was cut off from his share in the blessing of the other two sons. The salvation which was effected by the ark was merely of the body. For it was shared by living creatures that were clean and unclean—as well as by those eight souls.

This opinion is also very strongly confirmed by the statement of the cause of the preaching. For the Apostle says, "Unto this end was the gospel preached to the dead," by so great an evangelist and preacher, "that they might be judged." As if he said, "They ought not to be judged as angels and demons should be, unless they displayed a love equal to that of angels or a stubbornness equal to that of demons in the presence of so great a preacher and evangelist."

I would make these statements as expressing my opinion for the present, because the words of the sacred canon seem to me to urge them. Yet I am ready to yield to anyone at all, who will bring forward an opinion that is clearer and more in accord with the words. An opinion however that is explanatory must agree with the words

of the text and not be forced. For every forced opinion, which in the writer's fear of objections differs from the form of the canon, should be suspected of heresy.

This word, "that they might be judged," applies no less to all souls than to those in prison and limbo. For if the gospel was preached to the latter in order that they might be judged, then all the gospel by which they will be judged was preached to them. It follows that the gospel will be preached to all who are to be judged beforehand by Christ, through the preaching of Christ himself, that they may be justly judged. But what a gospel must we believe that will be,—how broad, how clear, how efficacious! Truly he that hears him thus coming and knocking, and hardens his heart, shall have no excuse for his sin in the judgment that will follow. But God will swear in his wrath and with an oath will declare his sentence that they shall not enter into his rest, but shall justly be bound with the equally accursed devil in everlasting fire. For it is not difficult for such an evangelist and preacher, through the enlightenment of his coming, to impart all necessary knowledge unto any souls whatsoever, however disposed.

Propositions drawn from the Same Words of Peter, concerning the Gospel and Knocking of the Son of Man, sent to Master Ludolph, Dean of St. Martin's Church, Utrecht.

Therefore the conclusions to be drawn from this text are:

1. That Christ preached in the spirit.
2. That Christ, being put to death in the flesh, preached.
3. That he preached to those in prison.
4. That, being put to death, he came to them in the spirit.

5. That those in prison had died in the flesh.

6. That those in prison, being dead in the flesh, were alive in the spirit.

7. That those in prison aforetime were disobedient to the truth.

8. That though they were disobedient to the truth, they believed enough for salvation.

9. That they, who had been disobedient, experienced the patience or rather the longsuffering of God.

10. That those in prison believed, but believed imperfectly.

11. That they, being imperfect, had need of a preacher and evangelist, that they might continue stedfastly in the wisdom of faith.

12. That the gospel was preached to these imperfect souls, that they might be prepared for the judgment.

13. That those, to whom the gospel was preached before Jesus preached it, were not prepared or wholly fit for judgment.

14. That if those, to whom the gospel has been preached after Christ came and preached it, do not believe, they have no excuse for their sin.

15. That whoever believes the great—nay the greatest—evangelist, so that he cleaves to him with all his heart, truly has eternal life.

16. The Son of man, the preacher, the great evangelist, will come, knocking, to every man.

17. That to every man, that hears his voice when he knocks and preaches the gospel, and that believes and clings faithfully to him, Christ is become an evangelist, who will not abandon him until he shall make him perfect.

18. That the whole process of their evangelization is the paradise which precedes the kingdom.

19. In a state of innocence, paradise would have

preceded the kingdom of heaven in time, duration, and deferment.

20. That it is reasonable and probable that Christ promised such a paradise to the thief.

21. That only those, to whom the gospel has been preached by the great evangelist, are properly adapted to be judged with the eternal judgment.

22. That the eternal judgment will show that the perfectly righteous are equal to the angels.

23. That, when the Son of man shall come and the great evangelist shall knock and at the same time flash like lightning, he that hardens his heart shall be worthily judged with the demons.

24. That everyone that is to be judged before the last judgment must have the gospel preached to him by the great evangelist.

25. That this gospel and this judgment are very different from each other.

26. That in the state of original righteousness paradise would, in time and duration, have preceded the judgment.

27. That the process intervening between the preaching of the gospel to those who are to be perfected and their entire fitness to be judged is not inappropriately called paradise.

28. That it is probable that Christ promised such a spiritual paradise to the thief on the cross.

29. That I do not think the thief—even in his own judgment—was better fitted for paradise than many most excellent Fathers of the Old Testament, who were manifestly the friends of God.

30. That if even those holy men had to be taught by the great evangelist so that they might be judged, I cannot easily believe that the great multitude of Christian people who go hence in this day do not need that great evangelist.

31. That no one departing from this life can be made perfect, unless he has been perfectly admonished, perfectly taught, and perfectly influenced by the preaching of the gospel to him by Christ.

32. That the decision of no mortal man can determine how much Christ influences, teaches and admonishes each man by the gospel of his knocking.

33. That Christ's preaching of the gospel is the only true, principal purgatory, although others also, but of lesser importance, may reasonably be endured.

34. That therefore this true purgatory is paradise, but that to one who loves God, it grows more and more acute, as he himself, becoming purer, burns more and more with divine love.

35. I think that this burning ardor and bitterness of a glowing soul is the true, last, and most perfect purgatory.

36. That much imperfection lay hidden deep in original righteousness; hence much cleansing remained to be done.

37. This preaching of the gospel is neither impossible for the preacher nor the one to whom it was preached.

38. That it is not clearly opposed to any passage of Scripture.

39. That if such a preaching of the gospel be assumed, many passages of Sacred Scripture will be more easily unravelled.

40. That it dishonors neither God nor Christ.

41. That if this be accepted, manifestly all the passages of Scripture will be harmonized.

These are the considerations that influence me to favor it; yet they do not influence me so fully that I will assert, etc.

Concerning the Eternal Gospel; when, and how, and by whom it must be preached.

1. The law of nature is far inferior to the divine Law.
2. Rectitude is a law of nature hidden from all men.

3. The divine Law is to all men an unsearchable abyss.

4. The manner in which the divine Law has been handed down can only be explained with difficulty to a very few men of great ability, who are possessed of much leisure, and besides are very studious.

5. The necessity of fulfilling the divine Law is laid upon all men by God's purpose, that they be conformed to his image and likeness.

6. Therefore the perfect establishment of the Law is to be looked for elsewhere.

7. The completeness of the Law of God is essential to the image and likeness of God.

8. The perfect fulfillment of the Law of God necessarily precedes the entrance of the kingdom of God; for one must be holy before he is blessed.

9. The divine Law is to be interpreted literally, because the Word made flesh does not speak in proverbs.

10. "The hour cometh when the Son of man shall not speak in proverbs, but shall tell you plainly of the Father."

11. What he shall tell us plainly of the Father without any proverbs will be the eternal gospel.

12. The eternal gospel is neither in the form of a parable, nor a proverb, nor can it be translated from language to language, nor can it be uttered by the voice.

13. The gospel, that is neither vocal nor parabolical nor proverbial, cannot be apprehended by any organic sense; for it is without any mental image.

14. That gospel would be preached most appropriately and opportunely when man is destitute of all his organic senses; for we do not apprehend pure cognitions and our desires in God through mental images.

15. Very few persons can, in this life, understand mental images without philosophic speculation.

16. Speculation in regard to mental images hinders clearness of understanding.

17. Inorganic power, when combined in operation with organic, has less potency in this life than in its own natural operation.

18. Within its own limits the inward man is wholly organic: the eye of the inward man is quite closed in intuitive cognition.

19. The inward man, unhindered, is also the end fixed by God himself in his purpose in making man after his own image and likeness.

20. The purpose of God has not been frustrated, with the result that God, who wishes all men to be saved, will forget or abandon his work.

21. "The true light lighteth every man coming into this world."

22. He will deem it worthy to lighten those perfectly, whom he has redeemed so highly and perfectly.

23. He will lighten men perfectly in regard to the work of redemption, so that, if they harden their hearts, they will have no excuse for their sin.

24. If the Son of man did not come knocking at men's hearts and enlightening them in regard to the work which none other could do, they would not commit the sin of hardening their hearts. "For now, because they have seen me, and hated both me and my Father, they have no excuse for their sin."

25. If "a man shall not be crowned except he have contended lawfully," and if he does not contend lawfully if he does not fulfil the whole Law, or if he leaves unfulfilled even one iota of "the exceeding broad commandment," it is clear that no one ought to be crowned, who has not fulfilled the Law in accordance with the capacity of his reason, and that too by the light of a lamp or of the rising day star. Solomon indicated this when he said, "The path of the righteous is as the light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day," i. e. unto all the light of the

Law in the reason, unto all the splendor of glory in the intellect, unto all the fervor of love in the will.

Whether St. Stephen was crowned immediately after his Death.

The above mentioned opinion concerning the deferment of the entrance into paradise of those who are to be purified is distinctly at variance with the word in the seventh chapter of Acts, that Stephen saw the heavens opened and fell asleep in the Lord. Indeed the Scripture says expressly: "For so he giveth his beloved sleep. Lo, children are a heritage of the Lord; and the fruit of the womb is his reward." But the fact that this statement concerning the Fathers of the Old Testament is no less inspired than the statement concerning Stephen, is precisely the reason for interpreting the latter with moderation; nay there is even greater reason for so doing in the light of still other words of Scripture. For if Abraham, being gathered in peace to his fathers rejoiced to see Christ's day, if he saw it and was glad; then how greatly must Moses, who when he was still in the flesh, spoke face to face with God, just as a friend speaks to a friend, have rejoiced to see Christ's day, when he was freed from the flesh! When he saw and talked with Jesus on the mount, who can set forth the degree of his rejoicing? And when Lazarus, full of sores, was carried away by the angels into Abraham's bosom, he rejoiced, not because Abraham received him in happy fellowship, but because he, together with Abraham and Moses, was comforted in awaiting the blessed hope. Truly these were "his beloved to whom he giveth sleep," sleeping in peace and resting unto this very end! Moreover, in the 11th chapter of Hebrews, the Apostle clearly says that "the saints through faith wrought righteousness and obtained promises." Yet at the end of

the chapter, after enumerating many more great virtues, he concludes: "And these all, having had witness borne to them through their faith, received not the promise, God having provided some better thing for us, that apart from us they should not be consummated" or rather "made perfect." It is clear, therefore, that there are grades, in that some have obtained the promise, while others have not yet obtained it. Nay if God has provided some better thing for Paul and the saints, that (apart from Paul and his followers) Abraham, Moses and David should not receive the promises, then Stephen had not yet received the promise at the time when the Apostle was writing these words to the Hebrews. And, since we do not understand about the vision of the Apostle, we ought for this very reason to admit grades in the promise. Nay more, grades in the blessedness of them that see God. Then why not grades in holiness? And who knows what grades there may be of perfect holiness? If it is better for us that the saints of old should not be made perfect aside from us, who will dare to decide that angels have been made perfect apart from us in that blessed vision with which they always behold the face of the Father, since in perfecting them aside from us, God will not have provided some better thing for us here? For in what will he provide something better, unless it be that they—in praying for their perfection—are also admonished to pray for us, aside from whom they will not be consummated or made perfect? Therefore since they are all "ministering spirits, sent forth to do service for the sake of them that shall inherit salvation," why will not God provide something better for us by not making them perfect apart from us? At any rate, it is sufficient for this point that no one can say that they are finally made perfect aside from us; although it is clearly admitted, that through the priesthood of Christ they have made progress in holiness, and through

his holy priesthood, in blessedness. But if they have advanced to that point, who will decide that they have been made perfect aside from us? etc.

Extracts from a Letter written by Wessel to Jacob Hoeck.

I am surprised that you, a most learned man, do not remember that that terrible fire is endowed with reason, and that the fiery law by the hand of God must be written in our hearts. A rational fire, I say, proving each man's work, and at the same time burning up the wood, hay, stubble, i. e. every evil affection, according to Augustine in *De Verbis Domini;* likewise in *De Civitate Dei,* Book XXI, Chapter 26. . . . Hence I think that the evil affections constitute love that is still imperfect when it is released from the flesh. . . . I judge, therefore, that in those who have been released from the flesh love must increase, and become as different from and unlike itself as the heavens differ from the earth, and as perfect as is the perfect day compared with the light of a lamp; in accordance with the word, "The path of the righteous is as the light that increases unto the perfect day." And I think it is because of this unlikeness that the Lord Jesus compared the kingdom of heaven to a mustard seed, and also to the sphere of heaven. All who die in grace, who, before they are released from the flesh, watching by the light of a lamp, look for the Lord, who are ready to receive him with exultation when they hear him knocking, and opening at once to him receive him for whom they have waited with great longing,—these exchange the light of the lamp for the morning star, for the light of the day star rising within them. And under this happy leadership and favor, in order that they may grow worthily, they pray with Simeon, that they may be released from the

flesh, and with the thief, who was admitted into grace, that they may be received into paradise. There, God himself, as Ezekiel promises in the 34th chapter of his eulogium, "he himself will search for his sheep, etc.; and will deliver them out of all places whither they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day; and he will bring them out from the peoples, and gather them from the countries, and will bring them into their own land; and he will feed them upon the mountains of Israel, by the water-courses and in all the inhabited places of the country. He will feed them with good pasture; and upon the lofty mountains of Israel shall their fold be: there shall they rest in the green grass, and on fat pasture shall they feed upon the mountains of Israel. The Lord Jesus himself, their shepherd, shall feed his sheep and shall cause them to lie down. That which was sound among them he will encourage, and that which was not sound he will cure, seeking for that which was lost, bringing back that which was driven away, binding up that which was broken and strengthening that which was weak, guarding that which was fat and strong, feeding them in justice." Hence the same shepherd and judge, even the faithful shepherd David, who was after the Lord's heart, doing the whole will of God, shall feed the sheep in God's flock until the dawn shall give place to the break of day, and both dawn and daybreak shall give place to the rising sun. And then first shall the kingdom be handed over to God by the shepherd David, who shall at the last—after the universal judgment—hand it over to him altogether perfect.

Concerning the Progress of Souls released from the Flesh.

This sequence in the guidance of souls from the lamplight of our present exile, in which the feeble wisdom of our

faith is as a grain of mustard seed, and as a small center which must increase to the immensity of the celestial sphere,—this universal progress and happy growth of souls up to the rising sun,—this I think, is purification. And I think that in this purification there is no punishment, which is profitable for a little, but that there is godliness, which is profitable for all things, and that that godliness essentially is purgatorial. Nevertheless godliness,—nay the burning love that has been deferred—has its own weakness and punishment. It has also a happy consolation. It is consoled by the presence of the Shepherd and Saviour. But because of the Teacher and Evangelist sent by the Father, teaching them the love with which he himself loved and loves the Father, they too, imitating that love of his, begin also to glow with love.

Since, however, they do not yet love worthily, they are still deferred, and their soul is afflicted. This affliction is not grief, but sadness in accordance with God's will, and this, as though springing from the love of God, is so efficacious that it results in the growth of their love. And the sadder it is, the greater is the satisfaction it renders and the greater is the growth of love that it secures.

Hence I am exceedingly surprised at the general carelessness of the Doctors of our School in not being influenced by the authority of the Fathers of the early Church to distinguish purgatorial from punitive fire.

Gregory Nazianzen speaks of a purgatorial fire which the Lord Jesus sends to the earth, with the desire that it should burn. And since this fire must cleanse the mental impurity of imperfect knowledge, of imperfect conceptions of God, and of imperfect righteousness, it will have to be capable of reasoning. Paul also intimates this when he says that that fire shall prove; now if it proves, it surely knows each man's work, of what sort it will be. But he speaks of punitive fire as that which is prepared for the

devil and his angels. For it is taking a very unusual and strange freedom with words to say that that fire purifies, if it removes nothing that is impure. (These are the opinions of Wessel.)

Why Prayer for the Dead is Salutary Meditation.

Even as the Psalmist exhorts "the angels that are mighty in strength, that fulfil his word, to hearken unto the voice of his word," in spite of the fact that they do this with all their might and strength, so we are permitted to desire and pray that they should do what they are doing. And just as praying for them, so praying for those who sleep, that they may be freed from their sins, is holy and salutary meditation; as it is holy and salutary to wish what God wishes and to pray that his will be done. For it is possible to direct a pious wish beyond as well as this side of everything that is first and to desire and pray for the will of the first in all things.

ADDENDA

LIFE OF WESSEL OF GRONINGEN

BY

ALBERT HARDENBERG, DOCTOR OF SACRED THEOLOGY

(*Incomplete*)

The learned Wessel, surnamed Goesevort, of Groningen, Friesland, was born about 1400 A.D. at Groningen in a house on Heerestraat in the neighborhood of Caroliweg. His father was an honorable citizen, a baker. His mother was in some way related to the family of the Clantes. Hence, on the death of his parents when he was a mere boy, being left with two sisters, he was at once taken under the guardianship of Oda Clantes, a most estimable matron. She had an only son, together with whom Wessel now received an elementary education and at the same time imbibed piety. Wessel had rather weak eyes and one of his ankles was somewhat twisted. But he had a very keen mind and was indefatigable in study far beyond all his schoolmates, so that he became an honor to the good and studious boys but a nuisance to the bad. In the course of time Oda, or Odilia, Clantes sent him away with her son to Zwolle. For the school there seemed to afford a somewhat better training than that at Groningen, especially in the House of the Brethren. Indeed Wessel had decided to embrace monastic life in the convent nearest Zwolle which they called Mount St. Agnes. But because certain superstitions seemed to be observed too much there he delayed doing so, God undoubtedly directing him elsewhere. For from his very boyhood it was always characteristic of Wessel to shrink from

everything superstitious. On this point many things have been told me by that pious and distinguished man, Master Gerhard van Cloester, director of Mount St. Agnes, one of the most intimate pupils and friends of Wessel, who had often heard Wessel talk of the studies and deeds of his youth and young manhood. In the convent there was an exceedingly religious monk, especially devoted to the Virgin Mother, as the times then were, who frequently urged Wessel to some special worship of the Virgin. To this, on one occasion he replied, "Father, why do you not rather lead me to Christ, who so graciously invites all the heavy-laden to come to Him?" Nor was he at all superstitious in the matter of fasting. For when the same monk urged him and others to observe certain fasts, he said, "God grant that I may always live soberly and abstain rather from sin and vice." I enjoyed hearing Master Gerhard van Cloester comment on these things, and greatly regret my failure to note down some other anecdotes, which I cannot now recall quite clearly.

Wessel wore the scholastic hood, as did all who dwelt in the House of the Brethren, none being admitted without having his head tonsured and wearing the gown and cowl. After being there a considerable time he began officially to instruct the young men and thus to train himself for his calling. I am inclined to think that Herman Torrent of Zwolle studied under him at this time; he who afterwards was a most intimate friend of Wessel at Groningen. When Wessel was an old man, he urged Herman to amend the songs of Alexander and elucidate them with a commentary. This Herman did, when he was one of the Brethren living in common and teaching the students, being lecturer in the fifth class at the time he wrote the commentary. When however he saw his mother hard pressed by want and poverty, his father being dead, he put aside the hood and returned to Zwolle, where he taught until he was very old and altogether blind. He got his name from the *torrent* which flowed by his father's house in the suburbs. When but a small boy, I saw him being led by a pupil in the streets, because he could not see from old age, besides laboring under the same affection of the eyes as did Wessel.

But to return to Wessel. Leaving Zwolle, he went at once to Cologne to complete his studies, and was admitted to the College called the Laurence Bursary, because it was founded by our Master Laurence of Groningen, Doctor of Theology. He was Pastor of St. Martin at Groningen; but as he was Professor Ordinarius of Theology at the Academy in Cologne, he resided there for the most part. He was born in that quarter of Groningen which they call "dat Olde Ampt," i. e. "the old district." He was accustomed foolishly to boast that when he was sent as Theologian of Cologne to the Council of Constance, he with his own hand had thrust John Huss into the fire.

In this Laurentian College Wessel studied diligently. Silently pondering and thoroughly weighing all things, he quickly mastered all the doctrine that was taught there, supplementing it with his own untiring study. Nor was he content with the mediocre instruction he received there, but he searched the sources, so far as he could for that time. At length he began to act with more freedom, to question many things, to investigate many things, to apply much that he learned from Aristotle, Plato, Themistius and others; and thus became greatly admired by all, but also an object of suspicion to many. He was always inclined to theology. Therefore, after taking the degree of Master of Arts, he at once devoted himself to Scholastic theology, easily mastering it, as it was taught there. For he used to complain that he "heard nothing there but Thomas Aquinas and Albertus Magnus; and if one but acquired a superficial acquaintance with them, he could readily become a Master at Cologne." As for himself, however, he was not content with these, but most diligently searched the writings of all antiquity. He also studied the liberal arts, and whatever besides is worthy of a liberal mind. He associated with monks, who possessed old libraries, and with studious Brethren, that thus at least he might have access to good books, both of theology and of other sciences. The result was that he greatly exercised and disturbed all the professors, especially those of theology, by forever bringing into the School something new, which was found in some

foreign science or was unheard of in theology. These things were tolerated at that time, although there was much growling and threatening. But God, who wished to restore some light to His Church, preserved him.

In the Benedictines' libraries, which were the oldest, he found many things and wrote them out with indefatigable zeal. He often crossed the Rhine to the Convent of Deutz and there read the works of the Abbot Rupert, which he especially admired. He used to say that he regretted that this man, in whom there was the spirit of Christ, was ignorant of so many essential things on account of the unfortunate age in which he lived with its many superstitions. From his books Wessel made many excerpts, which he supplemented with much from the writings of others. Afterwards he added not a few reflections of his own. Finally he collected all his erudite and holy meditations in one complete commentary, which he himself used to call "*Mare Magnum.*" I wish this had not been lost. Gerhard van Cloester told me that in his own time large portions of this work were extant in the convent of St. Agnes; these however had been sent to certain learned men in Brabant or Zeeland, so that not the least fragment was left in the convent. He said that many of the passages in the "*De Causis Incarnationis*" and "*De Magnitudine Passionis Domini*" were taken from this commentary; the Brethren themselves after the death of Wessel collected all these—leaf by leaf—out of books that had been torn up and thrown aside, holding them in as much reverence as though they were the books of the Sibyl. Gerhard said that Wessel had copied in his diary some of the opinions of Rupert of Deutz, which he greatly admired. Among these from the books of "*De Divinis Officiis*" he had noted the following: "We receive the true divinity and humanity of Christ who sitteth and reigneth in heaven, just as we may obtain the true spark of fire almost daily from the sun by the use of a small magnifying glass." Again: "Unto him who has no faith except in the visible form of the bread and the wine, no benefit comes from the sacrifice; just as an ass, pricking up his unreasoning ears at the sound of a lyre, does indeed hear the sound, but not the melody of the

song." Again in another passage: "If your son departing on foot returns by chance sitting on a horse, he does not on that account, together with you, make three persons, but just as before only two; for it is not fitting that the off-spring of a beast of burden together with your son should count as two persons. So also the Son of God, the Word of the Father, which was cast solely in divinity into the womb of the Virgin, in returning with humanity to the right hand of the Father, does not thereby increase the number of persons. It is not fitting that the addition of his human to his divine nature should double the persons, inasmuch as the differences between these two natures are far greater than between the horse and the man. For a difference of reason is all that separates the man from the horse; but very many essential differences, which it would take too long to enumerate, separate man from God."

Of this type were many of the reflections which Wessel had collected and which had been preserved in part by Gerhard and certain other studious monks; indeed Gerhard showed me a goodly portion of them. And these were Wessel's exercises at Cologne, together with the investigation of every branch of knowledge. In those days talented Greeks—for the most part Preaching Friars—used to come at intervals from Byzantium. From these he gained some acquaintance with the Greek language,—an almost unheard of achievement among us at that time. He insisted, however, that he could get nothing remarkable out of them. "Still," said he, "I learned enough of that language to prevent certain smatterers from deceiving me in matters that pertained to the Greek Bible."

His fame had now spread; but there was a great diversity of opinion about him, and envy was working among certain men. Meanwhile he also learned the rudiments of the Hebrew tongue from monks who had lived in lands across the sea, (mendicants of this sort are accustomed to crawl over the whole world). And this proved useful to Wessel; for he also learned the Chaldee and Arabic from them, so far as was possible from their acquaintance with these tongues. All this knowledge he afterwards polished up at Rome and Ragusa

and other famous places. Meanwhile it happened that the Palatine, Philip, was trying to secure for his Heidelberg Academy celebrated professors of the sort for which that school had the highest regard. At this time Wessel was called to the professorship of theology there. From this, however, he was debarred by the leaders of that school on the ground that he had not the title of "Doctor of Theology." And when he asked for it, the reply was made that according to the canons no one could receive promotion in theology unless he was first initiated into the priesthood. He absolutely refused, however, to be initiated. On being asked why he did not at least assume the first tonsure, he said "he did not fear the gibbet as long as he remained *compos mentis*." Nevertheless going to Heidelberg he began to lecture occasionally in the arts and philosophy. He did not however come to any agreement about a fixed salary, as he wished to make trial both of the school and of himself.

At about this time a contention arose in Paris among the theologians belonging to the schools of the Realists, Nominalists and Formalists. To Wessel the Nominalists and Formalists seemed to display considerably more judgment and learning than did the Realists, most of whom he had already heard. He now arranged his affairs and returned first to Cologne, where he received letters of testimonial in regard to the time and progress of his studies. Then he went to Louvain, and listened to the theologians there for some time. Here, he declared, he met with a little more learning than at Cologne, and he often conferred with the professors, disputing with them stubbornly and indiscriminately on any subject whatever. At length he reached Paris and listened to the professors one by one. He admired many learned men there, but especially Dr. Henry Zomeren and Nicolaus of Utrecht, who at that time ruled preeminent in the sect of Formalists. With these men Wessel disputed intrepidly, that he might if possible lead them to become Realists. He afterwards confessed that at this time he engaged in discussion chiefly in order to display his powers,—so fierce was his desire of conquering opponents,—although he always was anxious

above all things for the truth. As yet, however, the sparks of divine spirit, buried deep as it were under ashes, did not flash forth from him. Presently he joined the Formalist professors; but finally he perceived that there was no less error in the opinions of that sect than in those of the Realists, whom he had forsaken. And so he unhesitatingly went over to the Nominalists, whose doctrine he found considerably purer, or at least more subtle. At any rate, as he did not find a safer path or one which more nearly approached the simplicity of Scripture and of the ancient Fathers, he adhered to the sect of the Nominalists, bringing all that was excellent in the doctrines of the Schools to the highest perfection. This was about the time when the Council of Basel was becoming famous.

Now Wessel through wide-spread fame and incredible learning in every branch of science and art had come into the household of Nicholas V, Pont. Max., through the assistance of Francesco della Rovere, General of the Minorite Brothers, who was afterwards elected pope and called Sixtus IV. For the latter, being himself learned and a patron of learned men, drew Wessel to him, not only that he might use his assistance in daily practice in discussions for which he was most eager, but also that he might later make him a monk of his Order. Wessel however shrank from doing this. But using opportune fortune, he entered his household, in which he saw and experienced many things worthy and unworthy,—something of piety, but for the most part wickedness. Nevertheless he hardened himself to the latter, in order that through this man he might come more and more into the notice of all learned men and might dispute more freely without danger; at the same time he desired to obtain free opportunity of admonishing him to avoid idolatrous superstitions and open monastic lewdness; but especially he hoped to open the way for him to go to the Basel synod to which he knew Francesco would be called, as the highest official of the entire Order. And this was just what happened. For shortly afterwards he went there, and by the aid of his Master he came to the notice of all the learned men, was invited to many councils, and was heard

in public discussion several times to the highest admiration of all. The more learned the man, the more highly he thought of Wessel of Friesland.

But as the name Wessel seemed too harsh and so to speak barbarous to the ears of the more fastidious men, they called him Basilius instead of Wessel, either because they judged him to some degree a second Basil the Great, or because the Greek Cardinal Bessarion (who was most friendly) preferred to pronounce his β by our B rather than V, and instead of Wesselus began to call him Baesselus, and then Bassilius. I do not remember that Goswin van Halen, who related most of these facts to me, told me anything positively about this; for it is somewhat more than thirty years since I heard these statements from him. Others called him "*Lux Mundi*"; and this is attested by the writings of many persons to him, as well as by what others wrote of him. But malicious and envious men began to call him "*Magister Contradictionis,*" a name by which all persons connected with the Academy afterwards called him.

In company with his Master Francesco, Minister General, (I do not recall whether he was also Cardinal at that time), Wessel returned to Paris, where he passed through many experiences. Indeed he suffered much persecution; so that it is claimed by certain writers that he was driven from the school or the city on account of his censure of superstitions. This however I do not remember to have ever heard from any one who was intimate with him. At any rate it is certain that he was busy in Paris sixteen years, more or less, and that he set out for Rome together with his Master, now the pope elect. It does not seem probable that a pope, who was also a monk—and indeed a Minorite monk—,would have tolerated him, if he had been formerly banished from the theological school at Paris. Possibly he afterwards returned there and was then expelled; of this I will speak later.

That at this time he was still regarded highly by Francesco, who was now the pope called Sixtus IV, is clear from the anecdote he himself used to tell, as follows: On one occasion the pope, after his inauguration at Rome, addressed him

kindly, saying, "My son, ask me what you wish; I will refuse you nothing that is in keeping with my esteem for you and with your circumstances." To this Wessel freely replied: "Most holy father, my kind and just patron, there is nothing with which I would greatly burden your Holiness. I have never sought great honors, as you know; but since you now sustain the character of the Supreme Priest and Shepherd upon earth, I pray that your reputation may correspond with your name; and that you may so administer your high office that when the great Shepherd of the sheep, whose chief servant on earth you are, shall come, he may say, 'Well done, good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.' And you fearlessly may say, 'Lord, thou deliveredst unto me five talents: lo, I have gained other five talents.'" Sixtus replied, "This shall be my concern; do you ask something for yourself." "Well then," said Wessel, "I beg you to give me a Greek and a Hebrew Bible from the Vatican library." "These shall be given to you," said Sixtus. "But, you foolish man, why do you not ask for a bishopric or something similar?" Wessel answered, "Because I do not need it." Later Wessel left Rome and returned to Friesland.

. . . . . .

Rudolph Agricola in a letter to John Reuchlin concerning the study of Hebrew says: "Our Basilius also, who—you write—discouraged you (with regard to the study of Hebrew), vigorously urged me to pursue it; perhaps however it was in view of the fact that I had already attacked it and he was—so to speak—spurring me on in my running. But Basilius, of whom you write, is in the fatherland; between him and myself there existed the closest friendship."

Gerhard Geldenhauer and Johannes Oestendorp relate a prophecy of Wessel's as follows: Master Johannes Oestendorp, Canon of the Church of St. Lebuinus at Deventer, a most learned man of much zeal and experience, when a mere youth went to Wessel of Groningen, Friesland,—commonly called "*Lux Mundi*"—who was then an old man, and among other

things heard him, as though already foreseeing the future, say, "My zealous young friend, you will live to see the day when the doctrines of Thomas, Bonaventura, and other more recent dialectical theologians of the same sort, will be rejected by all genuinely Christian theologians." This I heard from Oestendorp, when he was already growing gray, in the church of St. Lebuinus, on the tenth day before the Kalends of March, 1528. Signed, *Noviomagus.*

Erasmus of Rotterdam in a pamphlet, "*De Pseudo-Evangelicis,*" addressed to the brothers of Lower Germany and East Friesland says: "Doctor Wessel has much in common with Luther. But with what Christian moderation does he set forth his dogmas as compared with most of those (theologians)!"

Philip Melancthon in an Oration on the Life of Rudolph Agricola: "As to what Wessel and Rudolph desired in theology, I remember that Goswin of Groningen, an aged man remarkable for piety and character, writes that when a youth, he was present at some conversations between Rudolph and Wessel, in which they lamented the darkness of the Church and censured the profanation of the Mass and celibacy. They also discussed the righteousness of faith, and the meaning of what Paul so often inculcates, that men are justified by faith, not by works. Goswin made it plain that they rejected the belief of the monks, who imagine that men are justified by works. They likewise thought that it was a mistake to reverence human traditions and to declare that they cannot be violated. I am not inventing anything; for Josquin wrote all this in almost these very words. Indeed it is quite credible that Rudolph should thus earnestly discuss Christian doctrines; especially since he was an intimate friend of Wessel, who possessed great ability together with extensive knowledge of all the sciences and acquaintance with the Greek and Hebrew tongues. Besides he had been drilled in religious disputations. Banished from Paris on account of his censure of superstitions, he came to Basel, where instead of Wessel they called him Basil of Groningen. Capnion used to say that he there taught Theology, Greek, and Hebrew at the same time to all the

studious youth, who desired to come to him. When therefore he in his old age had returned to Belgium, Rudolph, who was younger, often went to him, etc."

Thus writes Philip, who here makes mention of Josquin or Goswin, a pious and learned man, the Father of the monks in the House of the Brethren at Groningen. He was born in the village of Halen on the Meuse, and hence was called *Halensis;* he died in the year 1530. Reuchlin however died in the year 1528. From Goswin van Halen, once Wessel's *famulus*, I received many letters, one of which I copy here, since in it among other things he makes most remarkable mention of Wessel:

"Grace, peace and health to you, my dearest son, Albert. I heartily congratulate you on so ordering your affairs as to try to bestow all the time you can spare upon books,—and that too theological writings. I am so constituted that I cannot deeply love those who have devoted themselves to good literature in preference to theology. Further, I offer my congratulations not only to yourself but also to the entire monastery of Adwerd, hoping that you will do it honor, and that through you and men like yourself its former reputation for learning will be restored. I have known Adwerd for forty years and more. In the early days you could not find a learned man in all Friesland except by going to Adwerd, which at that time was not so much a monastery as an Academy. Of these facts the following would testify if they were alive:—Rudolph Agricola, Wessel of Groningen, Willem Frederiks, Pastor; Johannes Oestendorp, who is still living, Canon at Deventer, and my teacher; Rudolf von Langen of Münster; Paulus Pelantinus; Alexander Hegius, also my teacher; Johannes Canter of Groningen, father of Jacobus Canter, Poet Laureate; Lambert Fryling of Groningen; and (I had almost passed him by) "*eques auratus*," Onno van Eusum; also Arnold of Hildesheim; and others, who were accustomed to spend whole weeks, not to say months, in Adwerd, in order to hear or learn that which would make them daily wiser and better. And then there was that man who was never properly appreciated, Father Hendrick van Rees, whose breast was nothing less than

the hiding place of the Holy Spirit and the repository of Sacred Writ. I have repeatedly heard my predecessor, John of Oudkerk, say that all his discourse breathed forth learning and the sweetness of the Holy Spirit.

"But why need I mention these things in praise of men whose names are written in the Book of Life? Not only have I always praised and admired them, but following afar I would willingly kiss their very footsteps!

"And oh, how great a friend was Arnold Gryp to me,—a mere nothing but for him! Yes, and Bernard van Doesborch, later Abbot; and Henry van Edam, who had far more erudition than was generally supposed; and Rudolph Hilbrand, called Bolens, who was only prevented by his unending labors from becoming the most learned of them all. When Rudolph died, I thought I never again should obtain such a friend in Adwerd.

"You, Albert my son, are so immersed in your books every day that you cannot take me into your counsels. Is this filial? Is this befitting one who loves the studies of humanity? I readily admit that you are more learned than I. That I am willing to grant to any one, for I am content to remain a mere beginner. And yet it is a pleasure to meet a learned man. How often have I intimated to you through the Prior, your special friend, and through others that you should write to me; yet you have not done so! You were at Groningen, but you did not meet me! How should I designate this? Shall I call you ungrateful or proud? Epithets are offensive. I am unwilling to apply such terms to you. Shall I therefore say that you are hindered by greater cares and have forgotten me? Yet the reputation of being a man who forgets his friends is hateful and odious. Well, then, I will do this, if it so pleases you: I will forgive all the past; hereafter you must write to me.

"And that you may have some motive for writing, I will give you a theme. I desire to be informed concerning the origin of sects and heresies in Christianity. Nor do I mean by sects and heresies the various kinds of monks; for there are many different ways of living under the cross of Christ, provided we use them rightly. But I am inquiring about sects and heresies,

such as the Arians, Manicheans, and the like. And—to use the expression taught us by our Alexandre de Villedieu of Chartres 'that this may be made the easier for you,' I think that they abused the word of God by reason of their carnal mind; for the Law, nay all Holy Writ, is spiritual.

"Finally, the young man, who bears this letter of mine to you, was sent to me from Zwolle. I hear that his parents are respectable people living at Almelo. He has visited in Deventer and Zwolle and desires to serve the Lord. I have pointed out to him the many difficulties in his way, the hardships that monks must endure, and many obstacles of this sort. But he persists and is equally firm. As far as I can ascertain, he is prudent and of a quiet disposition. If I knew of any fault in him, I would not send him to you. I thoroughly believe that he will prove useful to you. Farewell, my dearest son, Albert.

"Written in my cell on the day of St. Clement in the year of salvation, 1528; in the burgomastership of Ludeken Hoerneken and Lubbert Clandt.

"Yours sincerely,

"Goswin."

"I knew that the Prior was away, and so I am writing to you. I would have written to the Abbot, but he is very busy and I did not think the matter was important enough for me to burden him with a letter from me. Now let it not be in vain that I have written to you first. He is trumpet-voiced, as I hear. Again farewell."

Dated as above.

"Now I beseech you, my dearest son Albert, to give my greetings to my Abbot; for surely he is mine, since I owe all that I am to him.

"I have decided to come to you with my grandson, whenever we shall be permitted to be alone. It is almost forty years ago that I was at Adwerd with my predecessor in the time of Walter Hildebrand, when he after luncheon made the whole assemblage gather in the Abbey and dispute almost till the

hour struck for vespers. I hope I shall once again see Adwerd like this before I die, if it please the Lord. For the third time, farewell."

Dated as above.

"Greet our brethren. I have decided to write something to you, if the Lord gives me good health. But first I ask you, being exceedingly anxious to know, how a man may know himself. Secondly, when a man knows himself, what sort of person will he find himself to be? And will he, who knows himself, learn what he is?

"See, now, I have suggested subjects enough to tire us both out."

All this Goswin wrote in this letter, and also what follows, sending it shortly afterwards by the same young man.

"The student I sent to you returned and told me that you wanted an Ovid; but he did not clearly mention any special work of his. Therefore I send you the Metamorphoses, presenting the volume to you. It once belonged to Father John Antonius Liber, one of your Brethren. I bought it several years ago from Antonius, the son of Antonius Liber of Soest. This man the Brethren at Adwerd supported at their own expense in the universities. Having been made Syndicus, he consecrated to God in your cloister his son, John Liber, the most learned of all poets, whose large volumes of songs are still extant. In my judgment it is enough to read Ovid, and all others of his style, once. Greater study ought to be expended on Vergil, Horace and Terence; i. e., if any real study is to be expended on poets by men of our profession. I would prefer you to read—and read frequently—the Bible; which, if I remember rightly, I have also said in your presence. But since one should not be ignorant of history, I advise you to read Josephus, Ecclesiastical History, and besides the Tripartita. Among profane historians it would be of no little advantage to read Plutarch, Sallust, Thucydides, Herodotus, and Justinius. Then it would do no harm to read through the books of Aristotle and Plato. To Cicero some time should be given, in

order to cultivate a pure Latin style. Next to our Bible, however, exhaustive and serious labor should be expended on Aurelius Augustine. He should be followed by Jerome, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Gregory, Bernard, and Hugo de St. Victore, a man full of much learning. Giovanni Pico, Count of Mirandola, thus divided his hours of study: the morning he gave to the philosophers; the afternoon hours to friends, to health, though sometimes to the poets and orators; the night, he said, he divided between sleep and sacred literature. Elsewhere he also says, 'I long since gave myself over to the slavery of books. Their rule over me demands such severe labor in reading and dictating, that I scarcely redeem my health from them.'

"But of these matters elsewhere. This one thing I say, He who reads divine Scripture and does not grow more and more worthless in his own sight, more and more dissatisfied with himself and humble every day, not only reads it in vain but even reads it to his peril: just as our, I repeat it, *our* distinguished Wessel was forever declaring.

"As regards Augustine Agg., I am sorry to report that he is tricky, wily, deceitful, and trifling. In the first place he pretended to have bought Suidas from the wife of Listrius, although it belonged to us. When this lie did not succeed, he said he did not possess it. Afterwards, finding this falsehood of no avail, he admitted that he had it, but said that it was not at hand. Standing on your holms in the presence of the Prior, he said that he would return it eight days after the coming Easter. Now again he says that the book is not in his possession. Things of this sort prove that, great as he is, he has no moral sense. Why does he do such things? Is it in keeping with the character of a Doctor? None but the most worthless scoundrel would act so. All who knew the man must regret this. Once more farewell."

Again shortly afterwards he writes thus: "But observe, my dearest son Albert, I do not now deny that I did not treat you rightly in not replying to you, especially since you were struggling with the dead and dying. Indeed the letter which you wrote me on the Ides of December justly demands an

apology from me. But a few days ago I was seized with severe pain in the kidneys and bowels, and did nothing up to the very day that I received your letter. What the Lord will do with me in the future, I leave to his will, beseeching his mercy. Pray for me, my most affectionate Albert. Give my regards to my special friend, Hendrick van Zuidwold, the Prior, as well as to all our Brethren and farewell again and again.

"Yours sincerely,

"GOSWIN."

I wished to insert these many quotations from that good man, Master Goswin, not only because they bear witness to Master Wessel, but also in order that my adversaries may perceive how I applied myself to learning in my youth, since all the pseudo-evangelical clergy are so persistent in their attacks upon me and my early studies. Moreover I desired that they should attest the worth of that excellent and saintly man, Master Goswin, who, were it not for the envy of false brethren, might have attained the greatest renown. But though he has been added to the number of God's elect, various works of his will finally come to light. For to his descendants he left many writings, and to me several dialogues full of piety and learning.

But, begging indulgence for wandering so far afield, I return to such written testimony in regard to Wessel as I now have at hand. For there is much besides, which I have not at present with me, that is found in books; this I will give at another time, if God wills it. Now I will add a few facts which have been published; afterwards what I have personally heard from reliable witnesses.

In the Chronicles of Ursperg

"At this time Master John Wessel of Groningen is famous, he who was once commonly called '*Lux Mundi*,' a man of rare and profound learning, some of whose sacred writings are extant: First, *De Benignissima Dei Providentia Omnia Suaviter Disponente.* Second, *De Causis et Mysteriis et*

Effectibus Dominicae Incarnationis et Passionis. Third, *De Dignitate et Potestate Ecclesiastica; De Vera et Recta Obedientia.* Fourth, *De Sacramento Poenitentiae, et Quae Sint Claves Ecclesiasticae; De Potestate Ligandi et Solvendi.* Fifth, *Quae Sit Vera Communio Sanctorum; De Thesauro Ecclesiae; De Participatione et Dispensatione Huius Thesauri; De Fraternitatibus.* Sixth, *De Purgatorio; Quis et Qualis Sit Ignis Purgatorius; De Statu et Profectu Animarum Post Hanc Vitam.* He departed this life in the year of our Lord, 1489. Thus every age has had its divine teachers, who have been endowed with sound judgment in the faith of God's elect and the knowledge of the truth." This is found in the Chronicles, p. 142.

Besides the works of Wessel which are here recounted, we have many others (although not all), which I add here with their titles. There is extant at Zwolle a printed volume of Wessel divided into two books, *De Causis Incarnationis* and *De Magnitudine et Amaritudine Dominicae Passionis.* Likewise a complete volume, *Super Orationem Dominicam.* Further in the house of a distinguished, learned and pious man, Master Christopher van Eusum, the grandson of Master Onno van Eusum, whom Master Goswin mentions in his letter to me, there lie hidden other works of our Wessel, which by the will of God will shortly be brought to light, viz. *De Stabilitate et Modo Figendi Meditationes; Liber Multarum Notularum de Scripturis Sacris et variis Scripturarum Locis; De Creaturis; De Angelis; De Daemonibus; De Anima.* Another large book—*De Dignitate et Potestate Ecclesiastica; De Indulgentiis; Libellus pro Nominalibus.* Also *Duo Libelli Practici in Medicina,* written in Wessel's own hand and tested in the case of dangerously sick persons. Also *De Triduo Christi in Sepulchro pro Paulo Burgensi contra Middelburgensem.* Also certain other writings, which thus far have been preserved,—first by the excellent Father Goswin; then by his grandson, Johannes van Halen, Father of the Spiritual Sisters; and afterwards by Master Regnerus Praedinius, Rector of the Gymnasium of Groningen, a most learned man,—as is evidenced not only by his published literary compositions, but by my own personal knowledge of him. For as boys in Groningen we occupied the

same room in the House of the Brethren, and for a long time slept in the same bed. Master Regnerus bequeathed these books to Master Christopher van Eusum together with certain other relics of Wessel. So much for this. Now I will add the most admirable testimony concerning Wessel by the printer Adam Petri of Basel, a very excellent and most learned man.

(*Here follow the letters of Luther and Adam Petri which appear in the Collection of Letters, see Vol. 1.*)

As regards these two letters that have been already given, the one written by Luther, the other by Adam Petri, I will now relate some facts I remember to have heard; for they have some bearing on the controversy which rages around the sacrament of the Eucharist even at this time, and which brought about my banishment from the Saxon circle. For although I long ago forsook the fatherland and everything else, in destitution following a destitute Christ, and was freed but a short time since from my captivity at Louvain, where I endured the utmost peril for the sake of the gospel of the cross; yet this was not to be compared in any way with the calamities with which I was tortured for all of seven years by certain demagogues of Bremen and other cities of Saxony, who stopped short only of death.

The facts are as follows:—Master Cornelius Hoen, Senator of the Emperor Charles at The Hague, and certain others trained for the kingdom of God, had found an old treatise on the Lord's Supper, which seemed to condemn the crude, Capernaitic eating of Christ's body and to establish it as a spiritual act, true indeed and essential, but only perceptible and appropriate to faith. They had found this among the papers of Doctor Jacob Hoeck, Dean of Naeldwick, at whose house certain of Wessel's writings concerning purgatory and other subjects are extant. This Doctor Jacob was the uncle of Master Martin Dorp, Professor of Theology at Louvain. Now since many of Wessel's writings were found among Hoeck's books, they thought the treatise on the Lord's Supper, was also Wessel's. This inference I neither approve nor reject, neither deny nor affirm. It is certain that Wessel thought and wrote about the Eucharist to nearly the same effect. And yet

I have heard that this manuscript of Hoeck's was exceedingly old, having been circulated among pious men and transmitted from one to another for more than two hundred years. Certain persons obtained it and regarded it as the greatest treasure, being convinced that it would enable them once for all to wipe out all the pope's artolatry. They also obtained several of Wessel's treatises, some among Hoeck's books, others in the convent of the Canons Regular of Mt. St. Agnes in the suburb of Zwolle, where Wessel was wont to spend some part of the year. For Master David of Burgundy, Bishop of Utrecht, had provided for Wessel's maintenance there. He was Wessel's most faithful guardian and special patron against the rabid Mendicant monks, who most persistently persecuted Wessel; for the latter on several occasions had completely routed them in public meetings at Groningen and Zwolle in the monastery of the Preachers, which in our time was in charge of that horrible persecutor of Christ, Gruwel. But, as I have said, Wessel possessed a most stedfast patron in Master David, the Bishop, whom he had cured of gout and other diseases by immersing and bathing him in warm milk.

The learned and pious men mentioned above succeeded in interesting Master Henry Rode, Father of the House of the Brethren at Upper Trajectum, which is called Utrecht. He went to Luther at Wittenberg, taking with him such books of Wessel, as were then to be had. (For all the writings in Wessel's own hand, which were found in his boxes after his death, had been burned through the fury of the Mendicant monks and certain others. This was told to me in good faith by those who had seen it with their own eyes.) He also brought the treatise on the Eucharist to Luther, asking him, in his own name and also in the name of others, to accept and approve of it. But Luther, who was always on guard against any profanation of the Lord's Supper, did not accept it. However, at table, Carlstadt again asked Luther to accept and sanction the view contained in the treatise, and to write against the carnal eating, which was the doctrine in vogue in those days. When Luther firmly declined to do so, Carlstadt, flaring up, said, "If you will not write, I will; although I am

not as competent to do so." Luther forthwith took a gold coin out of his purse and threw it on Carlstadt's table, saying, "There, I'll present you with that gold piece; try it, if you dare." Carlstadt, taking the gold coin, rose from the table, and began to write on the subject as well as he then could. But Luther, disputing the doctrine, defended τὸ ῥητόν in the words of the Supper, in no wise accepting the forms which most of the older writers use when they say that the bread of the Lord's Supper is the body of Christ either spiritually, or as a type, a figure, or a sign. He also was scarcely willing to admit that the bread sacramentally was the body of Christ except under a crude definition of the word "sacrament." And so at that time Carlstadt, being hard pressed, said that τοῦτο, "this," must refer to the visible body of Christ sitting at the table, and not to the sacramental bread. Since this appeared to be, and was, absurd and dangerous, it gave Luther the opportunity of writing against Carlstadt.

All this concerning the rise and progress of the controversy about the Eucharist was told me not only by Philip Melancthon, but also by a most distinguished man of Constance, remarkable for his nobility and learning, Master Thomas Blaurer, burgomaster of Constance, brother of Master Ambrose Blaurer, pastor at that very time in Constance. This Master Thomas, the burgomaster, lying in bed and mortally sick at the time, declared that he was present at the above mentioned dinner, being the guest of Luther. It was here therefore that the controversy concerning the Lord's Supper began, viz.—at Wittenberg, not at Basel or Zurich.

Luther however at that time wrote for Rode the letter, which was made the preface to the works of Wessel and besides gave Rode a letter to Oecolampadius, asking his opinion of the old eucharistic treatise, and urging that Wessel's works be printed in Basel. Oecolampadius, who was a very modest and timid man, when he learned that it was not approved by Luther, did not dare to offer his opinion of it, but sent it to Zwingli at Zurich. Zwingli was pleased with the doctrine (even before this he had seemed to be inclined to it),

and eagerly adopting it, began to defend it,—not however without asking many Doctors for their views in regard to it. Soon Oecolampadius also began to proceed more boldly. This greatly displeased Luther; and thus the trouble began.

Now Rode, on being sent to Zurich, left at the house of his host the works of Wessel, which he had brought with him. These were said at first to have been burned up by the angered host; but afterwards to have been ransomed—I do not know by whose money—and conveyed to Master Adam Petri, who printed them, adding the learned letter referred to above. Rode however, who had not been able to buy any copies and had been compelled to leave the works at the house of his host, returned to Belgium, not knowing certainly whether they had been burned or not. Therefore in company with other learned men, Wessel's friends, he saw to it that copies that had been made before, together with the treatise *De Passione Domini* and others, should be printed in the meantime at Zwolle.

So much for the two letters and the sole cause of the dispute about the Lord's Supper, which I have faithfully described, just as I learned it from Rode himself, from Goswin, from Philip, and from Thomas Blaurer. I hope the last is still living. If he is, I challenge him to be a true witness of this account. The others have died in the Lord. Meanwhile I would like them to be believed as good men, and myself at least as a faithful narrator. I am indeed sorry that Rode, who, I know, sought the truth with praiseworthy zeal, was so maligned by certain persons, even after his death; for it is well known that he died full of Christian hope and supported by the most sure faith, and was buried with the invocation of the Son of God.

I will now add a third letter, the contents of which will give me the opportunity of relating some facts which have no written testimony, but which I have learned from good men, who enjoyed the sweetest intimacy with Wessel for not a few years, although almost all these facts are alluded to in the Epicedium, as will appear.

William Sagarus, Councillor of the Emperor

"A thousand greetings, my good Albert. I have received your truly learned letter; and I have also received your truly pious gifts. For although not all of them are the works of Wessel, since I should not dare to assert positively that he wrote any of them, except the *De Missa*, yet they are all holy as well as learned, especially the painstaking treatise for the consolation of the weak. But the collection *De Canticis Canticorum*, which you intimate you sent by a servant girl, did not reach me. The rest were delivered to me by Egbert with true Attic faithfulness; for the fact that they were in large part incomplete was due—I know—not to any fault of yours, but to the too great haste of this same Egbert. He will come again to you very soon, bearing my more prolix letter to you. In the meantime, I hope you will collect something which you will wish to share with me. Meanwhile enjoy my small gift, *Brevi Arte Lullii*, and commend me lovingly in your prayers to God. Leeuwarden, 8th day before the Kalends of January, 1530.

"Yours most cordially,

"WILLIAM SAGARUS."

The above are nearly all the writings from others about Wessel, which I have had; yet I am not unaware that many other persons in different places make mention of him, but such references each person can note as he shall come across them in published books. However I will here add some facts about Sagarus, whose letter to me I have placed above. He was in the council of the Emperor Charles V in the Brabant Court, a most learned man in all directions. Besides other works of his, there is extant a most learned commentary, *In Legem Lecta*. This was greatly admired by Budé and Lilius and many others, especially before the Florentine edition of the Civil Law had appeared, which, as it seemed, loosed that inextricable knot and restored equitable relations. This Sagarus came to us at Adwerd with his father, a very dignified and venerable old man, both in order to see the celebrated

convent and also especially to search for some positive facts concerning Master Wessel. In his bosom he carried Wessel's book, *De Causis Incarnationis et Magnitudine Passionis*. It was evidently well worn, and he reverently affirmed that from it he had learned to know Christ. He earnestly asked us, if we had any certain remembrance and acquaintance with Wessel, to make it known to him. We showed him what we had that had already been printed. Besides these I myself had certain manuscripts, and I discovered some that were in the possession of other persons. I had also the Epicedium and the Epitaph which follow. I went with him to the College of the Spiritual Maidens at Groningen. There Johannes van Halen, the director of the Convent, brought out before us Wessel's skull, which Sagarus embraced and kissed with reverence, offering ten Flemish pounds, if he might be permitted to take it with him. But some of the superstitious old sisters objected, declaring that they had once seen his books and manuscripts burned up under suspicion of heresy; and that perhaps this was some Lutheran who was going to make an idol out of the skull and use it for incantations. Such was the plaint of the old women, who however in other respects testified reverently concerning Wessel, and among their prayer books showed some that he had left to them. Several of these, which seemed without question to have been Wessel's, I caused to be copied for Sagarus, and I also collected not a few pamphlets and sent them to him, mention of which he makes in his letter above.

Sagarus returned, as I hear, to the court at Brabant, but did not send anything back to me. Nor did I ever talk with him afterwards. For from Brabant he went to Zeeland, his fatherland; and it was said that later he altogether forsook pure religion. I did not keep any copies of what he borrowed for myself. For he had given his pledge that he would see to it that they were copied and then in good faith sent back to me.

Now I hear that there is an attorney at Mechlin, who has a miscellaneous collection of Wessel's writings. Perhaps these are the very ones that Sagarus received from me. I wish he would see fit to send them back to Friesland, that they may be

printed with others, if indeed there is anything in them worth reading. Certainly if they are Wessel's they will be altogether worth reading. For as it is commonly said: "Even the dregs of good wine are regarded as valuable"; and, "Even the autumn of beauty is beautiful."

Once I went to Mount St. Agnes, where Wessel was accustomed to spend some time of each "recurring year." There I talked with the venerable, learned and distinguished Father Gerhard van Cloester, who had been Wessel's most zealous pupil. He depicted Wessel's piety and dignity and great learning so fervently, that I could scarcely refrain from tears. He showed me not a few fragments of his works, most of which were from his book, *De Causis Incarnationis et Passionis*, which he reclaimed out of old rubbish and pages that had been torn up and thrown away. In this he had been aided by the labors of Gerlach van Caster, that good Father, who collected all Wessel's writings more faithfully than almost any other person. They showed me his Hebrew Psaltery and Greek Nazianzen, and also some verses from Rudolph which are not extant. They told me that Wessel had a large volume collected and written up by himself, which he called "*Magnum Mare*," because various notes of every kind had been brought together into it. They said that this had been carried away to Belgium. Perhaps that is what the good lawyer at Mechlin is said to possess. These Fathers, Gerhard and Gerlach, said that they also learned some Greek and Hebrew from him, and showed me elementary books as well as other works in those languages. In their own memorandum books on sacred literature they had made many annotations which Wessel had dictated to them.

When Gerhard perceived that I looked by no means coldly upon Wessel's writings, he promised to leave all his "Wesseliana" to me, if he died before me. For he was my fellow countryman, a true Ober-ysselian like myself. But after my theological promotion, I left my country and our most celebrated Adwerd; and while I was at Wittenberg, or Strassburg, or Basel, or under the protection of the Archbishop of Cologne, Master Hermann van Weede, or possibly was teaching at

Bremen, he died. For I do not know the year of his death. And so it came to pass that I received none of Wessel's books. However I would beseech the good Brethren of the Convent of St. Agnes, if perchance they still have any of his collection, to send them somewhere in Friesland, in order that at last they may be published in a complete edition.

Gerhard and Gerlach also showed me many writings of that most pious man, Master Thomas à Kempis, many of whose works are still extant, and among them that precious book, *De Imitatione Christi*. This Thomas was a canon in the College of St. Agnes, which Wessel also regarded with reverence. Indeed Wessel liked to be there more than in any other place, whenever he was among our countrymen, so that he might be near to the man calling himself the Bishop, who often used to linger months in Vollenhove in order to enjoy Wessel. From the Bishop Wessel used to return to Adwerd, where he had very many pupils, some of whom I knew, who had enjoyed intimacy with him, and who told me the things which I append. For from boyhood I was accustomed to visit my relatives, Johannes and Nicolaus Nortvild. Thus it came to pass that I heard and knew most of the older men of that period, and absorbed many of their weighty and pious utterances. For there existed not a few examples of pure monkhood in the convent at that time,—and indeed as long as Wessel's memory was sacred there and his pupils were alive. Of these I knew and heard at least fifteen, as I have written above. I also knew many others, some in neighboring convents, some in the country near Groningen and the western parishes of Friesland, others in the Sibbeciloan Convent and elsewhere. But the cenobites of Adwerd were by far the most outspoken in relating matters concerning him.

. . . . . .

Wessel set out for Egypt, convinced that all the books of Solomon and all the glorious library of the Jews were still preserved there. But on his return he was wont to say: "I made the journey in vain. For the Jews preferred to destroy all their library rather than to read what they did not wish to admit."

Johannes Canter, whom Wessel himself had instructed, teaching him among other things the Art of Raymond Lull, once propounded a somewhat inquisitive question to him. To whom Wessel replied, "Wait until I return for the second time from Egypt; then I will answer you," thus laughing Canter's curiosity to scorn.

There once came to Adwerd a certain most renowned Doctor from Paris; I am not certain of his name, but I think he was called Martin. At the table of the Abbot, Henry Rees, while all were eating, this Doctor began forthwith to ask Wessel many questions, but elicited no reply. All were in a fever of expectation; for they thought there was nothing which he could not answer. After luncheon, however, Wessel said, "Now present whatever you please." The Doctor presented many points. But such were the replies he received from Wessel that he jumped up from the table, threw off his bonnet and kneeling upon it said in deepest admiration: "Either you are a second Alanus, or an angel from heaven, or another Being, whom I will not name. Blessed be God! I am not disappointed in my desire. It is not in vain that I have sought you, nor in vain that the 'Master of Contradiction' was admired and hated by the Doctors of the Sorbonne." He remained with him for some time, much as did the Queen of the South. To his questions Wessel made adequate reply. This was told me by one who saw and heard it, Andrew Munter, Stoic Philosopher at Adwerd.

The Cistercian Order has a book, *The Dialogues of Caesarius*, a most absurd work, which used to be read at table in the convents of that Order. For its strangeness delighted the monks, who had but little knowledge of the world. Wessel however always listened to it, and then smiled sweetly. Being asked why he did so, he said: "I am laughing at its crass falsehoods. It would be better to have theology and the devotions of Bernard presented before the Brethren; for this contains not only absurdity, but much that is dangerous."

Nevertheless Wessel enjoyed being at the table of the Brethren, which is never without the reading of sacred literature or of other writings. At Adwerd, however, after his

admonition, Caesarius began to be despised, and soon was altogether discarded. So also was the book, *Concerning the Illustrious Men of the Cistercian Order*, which Wessel used to call "Nonsense polished up with monastic labor"; for the author was a careful rhetorician. But it is not far removed from the uncleanness of another work, *On the Conformities of Francis*, which Wessel abominated exceedingly.

On the day of the Lord's Supper at the meeting of the Brethren, in the evening before the "collation," as they call it, Wessel always used to read the Lord's discourse at the Supper, John XIII–XVIII. But when he was old (and besides his eyesight was bad), he frequently wandered from the text, and therefore was laughed at by the monks. He generally read in Hebrew, and that in a loud voice, while the monks listened to the strange sounds in amazement and admiration. This incident was repeatedly told me by John Gallus, whom we used to call "*de Valeta.*" To the Younger Brethren of Adwerd he expounded the Psaltery, and used to complain that the Vulgate translation was too obscure. When the Brethren asked about anything, he ordered the Hebrew codex to be brought to him, and from this he replied to their questions, explaining many other things as well with great learning.

Adwerd however was like an Academy; and to it there gathered in throngs from all Friesland distinguished and learned men, traces of many of whom existed in my time. Perhaps they still exist; and for the renown of the convent and the glory of Wessel in God I hope they will not perish. Wessel tried to restore the fame of the ancient Adwerdian school, in which the students of all Friesland used to be received. There were two schools: One was within the bounds of the convent; it is now a tailor's house and still keeps the name of the school. Here young men received elementary instruction. The other was in the village of Bedum; and this is called the Red School (de Roode Schoele) to this day. Here there were learned professors who instructed the youth in philosophy and theology. The Adwerdian annals say that once in a single summer as many as ninety students together with several masters died. This was designated as the school for all the inhabitants now

included in the Adwerdian Vestiary. Wessel tried to rebuild both these schools, and was assisted in his efforts by the Abbot Henry. But after the latter's death he was hindered by certain persons. Richard de Busto, a most learned man had been a lecturer in the school. In his library at Adwerd many remarkable treatises of his were preserved in my time; for he wrote on every subject of learning and philosophy. Emanuel, Bishop of Cremona, also was once professor there, a learned man of noble family. For he was by birth a Count, but on account of the Italian rebellions he fled and came to Adwerd, where he lived more than thirty years. As he entered the beautiful church at Adwerd, he struck the floor with the Bishop's crook, which he was carrying, and cried, "This is my rest."

. . . . . .

Paulus Pelantinus' Epitaph to Wessel

"This stone covers the white bones of Master Wessel,
Who was a brave lion among philosophers.
A triple tongue, Hebrew, Greek and Latin,
Enabled him to mount the famous pulpits of the Doctors.
Cologne and Paris, the two kingdoms of Minerva,
Felt the strength and beauty of his genius.
But the one merit of the man is that he knew everything knowable,
And was a very hammer to those steeped in vice.
The citadel of Friesland contains his ashes, Germany extols his honors.
Loving reader, say (a prayer) that the Omnipotent may bear (away) his spirit."

He died at Groningen on the day of St. Francis, which is the 4th of October, in the year 1489. He was buried in the same town in the Convent of the Spiritual Maidens, commonly called *ten Geestlichen Maegden*,—in the middle of the choir.

The Epicedium and Epitaph were given to me by Master Rudolph Hilbrand, surnamed Bolens, a pupil of Wessel's, who, being the associate of Pelantinus, had copied them from what had been written in Pelantinus' own hand.

ALBERT HARDENBERG.

LIFE OF WESSEL GANSFORT, THE FRIESLANDER,

FROM THE FIRST BOOK OF

THE ILLUSTRIOUS MEN OF LOWER GERMANY

BY

GERHARD GELDENHAUER OF NYMWEGEN

Wessel, surnamed Gansfort, but by the Greeks called Basilius, a Frieslander, was born of honorable parents in Groningen, at that time a city of East Friesland. From an early age he gave his attention to books, combating the barbarism of his age. Because of his great, constant, and incredible labor he not only deserved the laurels of theological distinction but also took rank as a lawyer and medical doctor.

Setting out for Greece, he most diligently studied Aristotle in Greek and whatever was then taught in that land. Then returning he visited the Academies of Italy, France and Germany, and earned such distinction by disputing and teaching as to be commonly called "*Lux Mundi.*" But since he greatly admired the teaching of Plato as being more divine and nearer to Christianity, and at times inveighed against Aristotle more sharply than the tender ears of Scholastic Doctors could bear, some called him "*Magister Contradictionis.*" In theological disputations he despised the great titles of Doctors, firmly holding to Sacred Scripture alone. Therefore if perchance any one in a discussion advanced an objection—as is often done—by saying, "The Holy Doctor says this; Seraphicus says this," etc., he used to reply: "Thomas was a Doctor. What then? I too am a Doctor.

Thomas scarcely knew Latin and was restricted to that one language. I have acquired a fair knowledge of the three principal languages. Thomas scarcely saw the shadow of Aristotle. I learned Aristotle in Greek and in Greece itself."

By this freedom of speech he roused the opposition of the Brothers of the Preaching Order, inquisitors of heretical irregularity, who at this time were exercising their tyranny against John of Wesel, theologian and distinguished preacher. But the reason for their less openly persecuting Wessel lay in that most reverend and illustrious prince, David of Burgundy, Bishop of Upper Utrecht, whose physician at that time Wessel was. Wessel frequently spent considerable time among the Canons Regular of Mount St. Agnes not far from the town of Zwolle. They observing that he used neither a horary nor rosary[asked him whether he did not pray at all. He replied that by the grace of God he did indeed try to pray all the time; nevertheless each day he recited the Lord's Prayer once, and hoped that the purity of that prayer would suffice even if he read it only once in a year. With increasing years he returned to his fatherland and there lived to himself and his people, occupied as was his custom in writing and teaching. When Johannes Oestendorp, my instructor, then a young man, came there to greet him, and consulted him in regard to the order of his studies, Wessel encouraged the studious and learned youth among other things to prefer the ancient writers, sacred as well as profane, to the neoteric Scholastics, especially the theologians; for it would soon come to pass that those incontestable, hooded, black and white garbed Doctors would be reduced to the position they deserved.

When he had passed his ninetieth year, with hearing and sight unimpaired, so that he never used glasses, could readily read the most minute letters, and even wrote a fine hand, he fell into a disease. To a certain learned friend, who was visiting him and asked him how he was, he replied that considering his age and his troublesome disease he was doing well. But one thing troubled him exceedingly, viz., that driven around by various thoughts and arguments he was beginning to doubt slightly the truth of the Christian religion.

His friend was amazed and began to urge him to cast all his thoughts upon Christ, the only Saviour. But feeling that an admonition of this sort would be rather irksome to him, he went away. When however Wessel saw him on his return an hour or two later, springing up as well as his health permitted, he cheerfully said: "I thank God, all these foolish reasonings have gone away, and I know nothing but Jesus and Him crucified." And in this confession he gave up his spirit to God. He departed from this life in the year 1489 on the day of St. Francis. He was buried at Groningen in the Convent of the Spiritual Maidens, as it is called.

CRITICAL APPENDIX

CITATIONS FROM

A = Earliest edition—no date, place or editor given,—in **bold-faced** type;
B = Adam Petri's edition, *Basel*, 1522,—in *italics;*
G = Peter Pappus's edition, *Groningen*, 1614,—in ordinary type.

In this Appendix important textual variations in the above editions are given. Mere orthographical variations and obvious misprints are not noted.

THE LETTERS

The References are to the Paging in A

LUTHER'S LETTER

a iii[4]—l. 16—**ornet** A and G; *addet* B.

LETTER TO GERTRUDE REYNIERS

g iii[4]—l. 16—**opes** A, B and G; *opus* Vulgate.

LETTER TO A NAMELESS NUN

Page 3 preceding *De Sacr. Euch.*—l. 32—**potum** A; panem G.

LETTER TO JOHN OF AMSTERDAM

XCVIII[1]—l. 5—**capellanus** A and G; *sacellanus* B. (Likewise in line 11.)

BRIEF LETTER TO JACOB HOECK

XCVIII[1]—l. 14—**M. Wesseli** A and G; *D. Wesseli* B.
XCVIII[1]—l. 15—**M. Iacobum** A and G; *D. Iacobum* B.
XCVIII[2]—l. 3—**Magister noster claram et famatam inter bonos uiros integram** A and G; *amice noster, integram et multis nominibus claram* B.

LETTER FROM JACOB HOECK

c ii[1]—l. 9—**praeueniunt** A, B and G; *proueniunt* Translator.

LONG LETTER TO JACOB HOECK

d[2]—l. 5—**diminuere** A and G; *dimittere* B.
d iii[1]—l. 27—**nullus** A and G; omitted B.
d iii[1]—l. 29—**nihil a patribus expressum** A and B; nihil a patribus scriptum, nihil expressum G.
d iii[3]—l. 30—**Vnum** A and G; *Num* B.
e iii[2]—l. 19-21—Sentence **Et si quis . . . loqui** A and B; omitted G.
f[1]—l. 17—**unificat** A; *uiuificat* B and G.

DE SACRAMENTO EUCHARISTIAE

a iii¹—Title—**de venerabili sacramento** A; venerabili omitted G.
a iii¹—l. 13—**tripodiam porrigat, panem poscenti** A; omitted G.
a iii¹—l. 18—**hoc est, in commemorationem** A; omitted G.
a iii³—l. 31—**tuum animum** A; omitted G.
b²—l. 1—**liuebat** A; timebat G.
b²—l. 7—**potentia** A; patientia G.
b²—l. 26—**angele** A; Agne G.
b ii¹—l. 2—**commemorandus** A; omitted G.
b ii¹—l. 28—**iste, qui in alio loco calix inebrians et praeclarus dicitur** A; omitted G.
b iii²—l. 33—**turbationis, deiectionis et maioris profligationis** A; omitted G.
b iii³—l. 15—**origine sua** A; ordine suo G.
c¹—l. 5—**faciens retribues** A; facies G.
c²—l. 23—**perspicaciter agnoscamus** A; omitted G.
c ii¹—l. 13—**sed et propter te tradat** A; omitted G.
c ii¹—l. 23—**potentiam** A; patientia G.
c ii²—l. 6—**extra** A; extra se G.
c iii³—l. 3—**Salomonis** A; Sirach G.
d¹—l. 28—**grandis** A; G inserts via.
d²—l. 12—**quod considerabat, ruminabat, quod ruminabat, suaue esse gustabat, quod suaue esse gustabat, desiderabat** A; omitted G.
d²—l. 15—**quod esuriebat et sitiebat** A; omitted G.
d ii²—l. 8—**Archacha ieuah** A; Archacha Jehovah G. Cf. d ii¹—l. 28.
d iii²—l. 18—**commemorando** A; commorando G.
e ii²—l. 19—**placens** A; placans G.
e iii¹—l. 5—**non** A; me G.
e iii¹—l. 15—**nato** A; concepto G.
e iii¹—l. 15—**dato** A; nato G.
e iii²—l. 4—**decreuerit** A; decreverat G.
g¹—l. 22—**audire** A and B; autem G.
g ii¹—l. 22—**mors quaedam** A and G; *quaedam* omitted B and A Fo. xxvii¹—l. 4.
g iii²—l. 6—**alitus** A; habitus G.
g iii²—l. 15—**quam paterne irasceris** A; omitted G.

DE PROVIDENTIA DEI

Fo. iiii¹—l. 19—**ferendi** A and B; serendi G.
Fo. iiii¹—l. 21—**prorsus** A and B; omitted G.
Fo. iiii¹—l. 27—**magnum** A and B; omitted G.
Fo. v²—l. 3—**motuum** A and B; metuum G.
Fo. v²—l. 6—**et non cooperantis** A and B; omitted G.
Fo. v²—l. 20—**regulariter** A and B; regulatur G.
Fo. vi²—l. 3—**animae potentiam** A and B; animae non potentiam G.
Fo. ix²—l. 21—**non iam** A and B; non G.
Fo. x¹—l. 26—**sanctam** A; sancta G; *facta* B.
Fo. x²—l. 4—**piorum** A and B; bonorum G.
Fo. xii¹—l. 15—**confidenter** A and B; omitted G.
Fo. xii²—l. 2—**non militiam** A and B; omitted G.

DE INCARNATIONE ET PASSIONE

Fo. xiiii¹—l. 12—**omnium** A and B; hominum G.
Fo. xiiii¹—l. 14—**hic factus est in caput anguli** A and B; G inserts this clause after Iudaeos, two lines below.
Fo. xiiii¹—l. 15—**a beato Stephano in actis Apostolorum, qui dicit** A and B; a Stephano in Actibus, qui dicit ad G.
Fo. xiiii²—l. 7—Paragraph in G omitted in A and B.

DE INCARNATIONE ET PASSIONE (*Continued*)

Fo. XIIII²—l. 9—**emundabit** A and B; G quotes more fully, and adds a sentence.
Fo. XIIII²—l. 18—Quotation from Rom. VIII. 29 in G omitted in A and B.
Fo. XV¹—l. 3—**in latitudine et profunditate** A and B; in latitudine omitted G.
Fo. XV¹—l. 24—**regno** A and B; rege G.
Fo. XVI¹—l. 11—**beati** A and B; beata Seraphin G.
Fo. XVI¹—l. 13—**permissum** A and B; promissum G.
Fo. XVII¹—l. 5—**ad salutem consequendam, quam** Iesus A and B; per quam oportet nos salvos fieri G.
Fo. XVII¹—l. 6—**quantum expedit crebro in eius meditatione** A and B; quam expedit crebro in ea G.
Fo. XVII¹—l. 11—**Tantam enim largitatem** A and B; Tantam enim liberalitatem, immo tantam largitatem G.
Fo. XVII¹—l. 21—**inter nos et deum** A and B; in deum G.
Fo. XVII¹—l. 25—**dignanter** A and B; signanter G.
Fo. XVII¹—l. 29—**sapientia** A and G; *scientia* B.
Fo. XVII²—l. 20—**plenitudine ubertatis** A and B; plenitudine artis et ubertatis G.
Fo. XVII²—l. 27—**cleros** A, B and G; claros Translator.
Fo. XVIII¹—l. 5—**magistri** A and B; jugum G.
Fo. XVIII¹—l. 12—**mandatum** A and B; et G.
Fo. XVIII¹—l. 16—**accipiendo** A and B; percipiendo G.
Fo. XVIII¹—l. 17—**vel placidius** A and B; nihil placidius Deo G.
Fo. XVIII²—l. 12—**meipso subsistens** A and B; G adds mihi sufficiens.
Fo. XVIII²—l. 13—**uita, uiuens** A and B; vitam uniens G.
Fo. XVIII²—l. 28—**omnibus** A and B; nobis G.
Fo. XIX¹—l. 3—**carnem sanctam.** Here twenty-five lines in G omitted in A and B.
Fo. XIX¹—l. 9—Here A and B omit five pages found in G.
Fo. XXI¹—l. 9—This proposition omitted in G.
Fo. XXII¹—l. 13—**parem** A and G; *patres* B.
Fo. XXII²—l. 17—et peccatum G; omitted A and B.
Fo. XXIII¹—l. 2—Non itaque certamen Agni et colluctatio ejus solum adversus carnem et sanguinem Agni G; omitted A and B.
Fo. XXIII¹—l. 3—in limine fusus G; omitted A and B.
Fo. XXIII¹—l. 6—Israel redimitur a dura ferreae fornacis Aegypti servitute legitimo ritu Phasae Agni G; omitted A and B.
Fo. XXIII¹—l. 35—Omnis amor Agni, licet minimo sui amore, fermentum adhuc vetustatis in se habet, et impurus est G; omitted A and B.
Fo. XXIII²—l. 10—dignus G; omitted A and B.
Fo. XXIIII¹—l. 3—Here ten Propositions in G are omitted in A and B.
Fo. XXV¹—l. 3—**uia** A and B; vita G.
Fo. XXV²—l. 20—Here seven pages of Scripture passages in G are omitted in A and B.
Fo. XXVII²—l. 18—Here ten Propositions in B and G are omitted in A, but they appear in the Folio preceding Fo. I, where it is stated that they should be read in Fo. XXVII.

DE POTESTATE ECCLESIASTICA

Fo. XXX²—l. 16—**ammonentis** A; *admonentis* B; amoventis G.
Fo. XXXII¹—l. 23—**retributionem quibusdam** A and B; omitted G.
Fo. XXXVIII¹—l. 7—**auisari et** A and G; omitted B.
Fo. XXXVIII¹—l. 9—**auisentur et** A and G; omitted B.

DE POTESTATE ECCLESIASTICA (*Continued*)

Fo. XL²—l. 23—**anteferreas** A, B and G, perhaps misprint for **aut ferreas**; *cf.* Long Letter to Hoeck d ii²—l. 25. **Clauibus aut ferreis instructas.**

Fo. XLI¹—l. 22—**Et Hieronymus aperte sanctam rusticitatem asserit nocere in ecclesia dei, quanto destruentibus eam non resistit** A and B; omitted G.

Fo. XLI¹—l. 26—**Sceleratis ergo potestatibus oportet obuiare, nisi velimus occulta societate participare** A and B; omitted G.

DE SACRAMENTO POENITENTIAE

Fo. XLII²—l. 27—**et ignorantia** A and B; omitted G.

Fo. XLIII²—l. 1—**et lucidum** A and B; omitted G.

Fo. XLIII²—l. 15—**in coelo** G; A and B omit the phrase here, but insert it in the Letter to Hoeck.

Fo. XLIII²—l. 23—**ferre** A and B; omitted G. (A and B however omit it in the Letter to Hoeck.)

Fo. XLIII²—l. 25—**non ueritas sacrae scripturae** A and B; **et veritas** G. (A and B omit **sacrae scripturae** in the Letter to Hoeck.)

Fo. XLIII²—l. 26—**hinc** A and B; huic G.

Fo. XLIII²—l. 30—**Doctores plerique.** From this point to end of quotation A and B omit many sentences, which are however found in their complete Letter to Hoeck.

Fo. XLIIII¹—l. 13—**sanctorum** A and B; justorum G. (A and B have **iustorum** in the Letter to Hoeck.)

Fo. XLV¹—l. 1—**tantam** A and B; tanta G.

Fo. XLV²—l. 13—**uult et** A and B; omitted G.

Fo. XLV²—l. 31—**impudenter** A and B; imprudenter G.

Fo. XLVIII¹—l. 13—**etiam si ueniret angelus de celo** A and G; omitted B.

Fo. XLVIII¹—l. 18—**non** A and B; omitted G.

Fo. XLIX²—l. 2—**quanto** A and G; *quando* B.

Fo. LI¹—l. 13—**illic finem** A and G; *illinc* B.

Fo. LI¹—l. 14—**uiae** A and G; *uitae* B.

Fo. LIII²—l. 19—**literale** A and B; liberale G.

Fo. LVIII¹—l. 28—**essentiali** A and B; omitted G.

Fo. LIX²—l. 13—**manebimus debitores et quamdiu** A and B; omitted G.

Fo. LXII²—l. 13—**praeterito** A and G; *peccato* B.

Fo. LXII²—l. 21—**iusticialem** A and B; iustitiam G.

DE COMMUNIONE SANCTORUM

Fo. LXVI¹—l. 7—**autentice** A and B; omitted G.

Fo. LXXI¹—l. 10—**et multipliciter fuerint** A and B; omitted G.

Fo. LXXV¹—l. 15—**instaurantis** A and G; omitted B.

DE PURGATORIO

Fo. LXXVII²—l. 8—**uiae** A and G; *uitae* B.

Fo. LXXVIII¹—l. 7—**Participatio sanctificationis quaedam actualis, quaedam habitualis** A and B; omitted G.

Fo. LXXXV²—l. 17—**omni igne corporali** A and B; omitted G.

DE PURGATORIO (*Continued*)

Fo. LXXXVI[1]—l. 21 —**Non enim filiis gratiae partius prouidit quam filiis irae** A; *Non enim filius gratiae partius prouidit quam filius irae* B; omitted G.

Fo. LXXXVI[2]—l. 25—**puritatis** A and G; *impuritatis* B.

Fo. XC[1]—l. 20—**Euangelium aeternum quale et quando et a quo euangelisandum** A and B; omitted G.

Fo. XCI[2]—l. 8—In the following extract from Wessel's Long Letter to Hoeck A and B present the same text, condensing certain sentences and omitting others. G refers the reader to the complete Letter.

Fo. XCI[2]—l. 11—**Ignem inquam rationabilem opus uniuscuiusque probantem, simulque lignum, fenum, stipulam exurentem, uidelicet omnem malum amorem, secundum August. in de verbis domini. Itemque li. XXI. ca. XXVI. de ciui dei** A and B. Here several sentences are condensed. Following the reference four sentences are omitted.

Fo. XCI[2]—l. 15—**a carne solutam** A and B; **in a carne solutis** A, B and G in the complete Letter.

Fo. XCI[2]—l. 16—A and B omit a sentence after **puto**, and substitute **Existimo** for Puto in the following sentence.

Fo. XCI[2]—l. 22—Here A and B omit five sentences.

Fo. XCI[2]—l. 24—**exultatione** A and B; **expectatione** A, B and G in complete Letter.

Fo. XCII[2]—l. 4—**tantoque santior** A; *tanto satisfactior* B; in complete Letter **tanto sanctior** A, B and G.

Fo. XCII[2]—l. 24—**ut a peccatis soluantur** A and B; omitted G. (G however inserts this clause in the like passage from the *De Oratione Dominica*, p. 139.)

INDEX

Italics indicate statements or citations that may be verified by means of the immediately following references in **bold face** type.

A

Abélard, influence on education, **i 21**, 62; a Conceptualist, 66; originality, 117

Abraham, typical of saving religious experience, *i 207*, **ii 36, 43, 145, 311**; and celibacy, *i 221*, **ii 265**

Absolution given by God alone, ii 197, *222*, 300

actualis, ii 279

actus, and *habitus*, ii 73–74, 266; *actus obiectalis*, 269; *actus formales*, 269

Adwerd, monastery, library, and church, *i 102*, **ii 344**; schools, *i 103*, **ii 327, 343–344**; Wessel's influence at, *i 102–103*, **ii 342–343**; *i 104*, **ii 341, 344**; Wessel's letters treasured at, *i 177*, *179*, **250, 261**; Wessel and the Paris Doctor *104–105*, **ii 342**; Wessel and Agricola, *i 105*, **ii 326**; visit of Sagarus, *i 111*, *159*, **ii 338–339**

Agricola, Rudolph, Humanist, i 37; Wessel's disciple, *75*, *105*, *109*, *152–153*, **ii 325–327**; superior to Wessel in philology, i 119

Albertus Magnus, at University of Cologne, *i 52–55*, **ii 319**; representative Realist, *i 66*, **288**

Alexander of Aphrodisias, quoted by Wessel, *i 123*, *206*, ii 83–85

Allegory, *i 211*:—combat of Lamb and Dragon, **ii 122–136**; Cross and Tree of Life and Flaming Sword, **ii 137–141**

Ambrose quoted by Wessel, *i 206*, **290, 312, ii 60, 181, 296**

Angels, enlarged vision, ii 69; characteristics and service, 109–113; and Pope Clement, i 304

Anselm, works studied by Brethren of the Common Life, i 11

Anthony, Saint, and the sacraments, ii 61, 196, 198; needed no papal remission, 251

Antoninus, Saint, on indulgences, i 299–301; on Virginity, ii 265

Antonius de Castro attacks Wessel in his *Impugnatorium*, i 168, 227–228

Aquinas, Thomas, title, **i 43**; at University of Cologne, *52*, *55*, **ii 319**; and astrology, i 123; Wessel questions his interpretation of Aristotle, *78*, *119*, **ii 345–346**; quoted by Wessel—often disapprovingly:— *i 122–123*, *206*; as a Scholastic, **288**; on indulgences, **294**; on influence of his teaching, **309**; on reason and will, **ii 85**; on brotherhoods, **256–257**; on Virginity, **265–266**; Wessel's prophecy concerning, *i 104*, **ii 326, 346**

Arabic, Wessel's knowledge of, ii 321

Aristotle, study of his works developed Realism, i 38, 65–66; disapproved by Luther, 232; recommended by Goswin, ii 330; studied by Wessel, *i 57*, **ii 319**; *i 78*, *119*, **ii 345–346**; quoted by Wessel, *i 123*:— on the active and potential intellect, **ii 83–88**; on conception of death, *i 210*, **ii 92–93**; on the curiosity of philosophers, **ii 210**

Arius as representative of heresy, i 286

Arsenius, concerning his attitude to sacraments, ii 198

Athanasius quoted by Wessel, i 123

Augustine, study of his works

Augustine—(*Continued*)
urged by Gerhard Groot, i 11; by Goswin, ii 331; conception of divine destiny of Roman Empire and Church, i 23; influence on Scholastics, 65–66; often quoted by Wessel—always approvingly:— *123*, *206*; on belief in the gospel, *136*, *184*, 305–306, ii 166; on keys of the Church, *i 217*, 302–303; on forgiveness of sins, 271, 311–314, ii 199–200; on stubbornness, i 285; admonished St. Jerome, 286; expressed no opinion on indulgences, 296; on purgatory, 319, ii 281, 285, 289, 292–293; on love of self, i 324; on city of God, ii 136; on guilt of mob against Christ, 170, 181; on time of judgment, 240
Aureole, ii 266–272
Averroes quoted by Wessel, *i 206*, ii 86

B

Babylonish Captivity, effects of, i 29, 64
Bähring's *Life of Wessel*, i x
Baptism, part of priest in, ii 222–223, 234; Christ's compared with John's, 228; requires no externals, 234; no penance imposed, 235; cleanses from past but not subsequent sin, 299–300
Bargellan's prefatory letter to 1522 edition of Farrago, i 157
Basel, Wessel at, *vide* Councils, University
Bayle, his biography of Wessel, i x; calls Wessel "the precursor of Luther," 163
Benedict XIII (Peter of Luna), example of papal error, *i 215*, ii 152; and Gerson, i 310
Benedictines, efforts for reform, i 14; their library at Cologne extensively used by Wessel, *i 55*, ii 320
Benefices, collation of, ii 155–156
Bernard of Clairvaux, works studied by Brethren of the Common Life, i 11; quoted by Wessel, *i 123*, *206*:— on pernicious prelates, 272; on self-love, 320; on abnegation of will, ii 164; contradicted popes, 178, 181; study of his works urged by Goswin, 331; by Wessel, 342
Bernard of Meppen, Wessel's letter to:— summary of, *i 176–177*, translation, 246–249; John of Amsterdam's letter to:— summary of, *i 179*, translation, 261–265
Bessarion, Cardinal, friendship with Wessel, *i 73–74*, ii 324; candidate for papacy, i 83
Binding and loosing, Wessel's conception of, *i 144*, *217*, 271, 302–305, 312–313
Bishops in the Netherlands in Wessel's time, i 15–17
Blaurer, Thomas, witnessed the controversy over the Eucharist, ii 336–337
Bleecker, Harmanus, i vi
Bonaventura, Wessel's prophecy concerning, *i 104*, ii 326, 346; on value of indulgences, i 294
Bonetus, his works studied by Wessel, *i 70*, 285
Boniface VIII established indulgences, i 300
Boniface IX, example of papal error, *i 215*, ii 152
Brethren of the Common Life, founded by Gerhard Groot, i 5–6; aims, 7; community life, 7–10; educational work, 11; influence in general, 11–12; influence on Reformation, 12; influence on Wessel and other Dutch scholars, 13, 126, 134, 151, 154; influence on Humanism, 25; schools attended by Wessel, *43–49*, ii 317–318; sanctioned by Sixtus IV, i 86
Brotherhoods, Wessel's views concerning, ii 255–260
Bucer, Martin, student at Heidelberg, i 91; influenced by Rhodius, 160
Bulls, leaden, Wessel's attitude toward, i 292–294, 301, 304, ii 152, 228; St. Peter's bull, *i 220*, 295–296, ii 252–253
Burgundy, Dukes of, rule in the Netherlands, i 18–20
Buridanus, cited as authority by Hoeck, i 277; Wessel's reply concerning, 287–288

C

Calixtus III, pontificate of, i 34
Calvin, relation to the Reformed Churches, i 166

Carlstadt in controversy over the Eucharist, *i 165, 188*, **ii 335–336**
Causes, primary and secondary, *i 209–210*, **ii 73–75, 77–78**
Celibacy, Wessel's views concerning, *i 221*, **ii 265–272**
Chaldee, Wessel's knowledge of, ii 321
Charles the Bold, results of his death to the Netherlands, i 4; half-brother of David of Burgundy, 107
Christ, Wessel's conception of name of, ii 57–59, 114–115, 119–120, 197
Church, criticism of, i 14–40; Wessel's statement of belief in, *136, 215*, **ii 166**; i 299, ii 201; conception of, *i 137–139, 207*, **ii 202–203, 249–250**; corrupt administration of, *i 209*, **ii 173–180**; riches and judicial authority harmful to, *i 215*, **ii 155**; extent of, *i 218*, **ii 202–203**; changes in rites, 166, 196–197; *vide* Communion, Keys, Pope, Prelates, Treasury
Cistercians, efforts for reform, i 14
Clantes, Odilia, adopted Wessel, *i 43*, **ii 317**
Classics, and the Renaissance, i 23–25; and Humanism, 24–26; 37–38; at University of Cologne, 56; study of, in fifteenth century, ii 330–331
Clémanges' influence on Church, i 33
Clement V, Wessel's criticism of, i 301, 304
Clement VII in Western Schism, i 29–30
Clergy, condition of, in the Netherlands, i 17–18; Wessel's criticism of, ii 182, 213, 215
Cologne, importance of, i 52; *vide* University
Communion of Saints, summary of Wessel's treatise on, *i 219–221*, translation, **ii 249–272**; Wessel's conception of, *i 127*, **ii 254**; *i 139–140, 207*, **ii 249–250**; *i 220*, **ii 254**
Confession, induces growth in grace, but is not essential, *i 218–219*, **ii 197–201, 221–223, i 245**; part of priest in, 310–311, ii 222–224; and subsequent sin, i 326–328, ii 298–300; not judicial, 223–233
Constance, *vide* Councils
Contrition, Wessel's view of, ii 215–222, 298–300
Councils, Reforming, i 30–33; freedom of debate in, *39*, **ii 205**; Wessel's attitude to, *i 136*, **ii 202, 228, 250**; *i 138–139*, **ii 202–203**; Council of Pisa, action of, i 30; Council of Constance, action of, 30, *215*, **ii 152, 178**; Council of Basel, action of, i 31; Wessel at, ii 323–324; Lateran Council, decree concerning Eucharist, i 191
Cusa, Cardinal, opinion that the earth revolved, i 22; career, 39–40; library of, *186*, 332
Cyprian increases hierarchical tendency of the Church, i 140

D

d'Ailly, Peter, influence for reform, i 33; in Councils, 65; Nominalist, 67; and astrology, 123; approvingly mentioned by Wessel, *123, 151*, **308–309**
David, the Psalmist, typical of saving religious experience, *i 207, 221*, **ii 240, 241, 268, 311**
David of Burgundy, career, i 107–108; Wessel his physician, *106, 120*, **ii 335**; protected Wessel, *i 90, 98–99*, **331, ii 346**; provided maintenance for Wessel, *i 105*, **ii 335**; entertained Wessel at Vollenhove, *i 105, 172*, **ii 341**; appreciative letter to Wessel, *i 118, 169, 185*, **331**
Day star, figure often used by Wessel in describing soul's progress, *i 185, 206*, **246–247, 321, ii 286, 309**
Dead, prayers for, *vide* Prayers
Death, not a terror to the Christian, *i 210*, **ii 92–93**; a transition to the fatherland, *i 127, 208*, **ii 93–94**
de Groot's biography of Wessel, i x
Denifle's conclusions as to Wessel's Protestantism, i 130
de Oratione (*Super Orationem Dominicam*), Wessel's treatise on Prayer, i 111, 168, ii 333
De Thou, on Wessel's relation to University of Paris, i 71, 78

Doedes, J. I., one of Wessel's biographers, i x, 158; opinion of Wessel as pre-Reformationist, 163
Dominicans, efforts toward reform, i 14; influence in University of Cologne, 52
Dragon, combat with Lamb, *i 211*, ii 122–136

E

Ecclesiastical Power, Wessel's treatise on: early translated into German, i 158, 164; summary of, *214–216*, translation, ii 151–184; scandalous lives of prelates, *i 215*, ii 155; obedience to prelates, *i 215*, ii 157–158, 166, *i 216*, ii 178; obedience to kings, *i 216*, ii 176–177; *vide* Excommunications, Indulgences, Kings, Pastors, Penance, Prelates, Priest, Pope, Purgatory, Sacraments, Treasury of Church
Eckhart, influence of, i 5; neglected at University of Cologne, 54; Wessel avoids his pantheism, 211
Elizabeth, Queen of Hungary, and Virginity, *i 221*, ii 269–271
Engelbert of Leyden, summary of Wessel's letter to, *i 180–181*, translation, 268–275; extract from, ii 187
England, results of Hundred Years' War in, i 27–28
Epicedium, by Paul(us) Pelantin(us), i 119; mentioned by Hardenberg, ii 337, 339; extracts from, i 48, 117, 120
Epitaph to Wessel by Paul(us) Pelantin(us), translation, ii 344
Erasmus, trained in school of Brethren of the Common Life, i 13; his criticism of monks, 13, 102; Humanist, 25; querulousness of, 115; contrasts Wessel's dogmas with Luther's, *129*, ii 326; urged reform—not overthrow—of papacy, i 142; and the Reformation, 149–150; his critical edition of Greek Testament, 152, 162; letter to Willem Frederiks, 154–155
Eternal Gospel, Wessel's conception of, *i 223*, ii 307–310; questions to be solved concerning, i viii
Eucharist, authorship of treatise on, *i 189*, ii 334; Hardenberg's account of controversy over, *i 160–161*, *187–188*, ii 334–337; Wessel's treatise on:—summary of, *i 187–202*, translation, ii 3–70; Wessel's conception of, as a memorial sacrament, *i 190–195*, ii 3–4; induces love, *i 193*, ii 4–5, *i 195*, ii 23; induces spiritual presence of Christ, *i 193*, ii 7; means of salvation to "the little ones," *i 194–195*, ii 16–17; effects of, *i 194*, ii 12–14, *i 198*, ii 23, 49–50; *i 199*, ii 14, 16, 264–265; spiritual—not corporeal, *i 195–196*, ii 21, 23, 25, 33, 43, 49–52, 68–69; elements and priest unnecessary, *i 196*, ii 29–31; effect even of sight of elements, *i 196*, ii 38–39; angels ate of Christ's body, *i 197*, ii 51; essential to spiritual life, *i 195*, ii 21–25; Christ corporeally present, *i 197–198*, ii 24, 56–57, 60–61; received through the mental faculties, *i 199*, ii 6, 8, 14, 117; commanded, 5, 11, 29, 46; essential to redemption, 37, 262; preparation for, 42–45, 48; gospel doctrine concerning, 62–68; quotation concerning the Eucharist in *Mare Magnum*, 320
Eugene IV, and indulgences, i 294, 327; contradicted by Bernard of Clairvaux, ii 178, 181
Europe, political history in fifteenth century, i 25–29
Excommunication, sin—not excommunication—separates soul from God, *i 209*, ii 194–195; pope's authority concerning, *i 217–218*, ii 194, 205
Explorers in fifteenth century, i 22

F

Faber, John, contrasts Wessel's doctrines with Luther's, i 161
Faith and "good works," *i 130–133*, ii 35–36, 143–147
Farrago, earliest edition of, i vi, 158, 203, 227–228; its influence on Reformation, 164; date of various editions, 204; structure of, 204; source of materials, 204; fragmentary character of, 205; writers cited in, 206; summary of, *203–224*, translation, ii 73–315;

Farrago—(*Continued*)
vide Wessel (subdivision—Writings), Providence, Incarnation, Ecclesiastical Power, Penance, Communion of Saints, Purgatory
Fasting, Wessel's opinion of, *i 47*, ii 318; i 243–245; ii 156
Female sex, Wessel's attitude to, *i 173–175*, 239–245; ii 45, 151, 196, 262; *vide* Elizabeth, Magdalene, Virgin Mother, Virginity
Formalists, i, 66; Wessel's attitude to, 236, 285, 288, ii 322–323
France, results of Hundred Years' War in, i 27–28
Francis of Assisi quoted approvingly by Wessel, *i 206*, ii 77, 181
Franciscans, efforts toward reform, i 14; Sixtus IV prominent among, *36*, *74*, ii 323–324
Frederick of Blankenheim, Bishop of Utrecht, i 16
Frederick III of Hapsburg, his reign, i 27; crowned by Nicholas V, 34
Frederiks, Willem, disciple of Wessel, i 154–155
Friedrich's Life of Wessel, i x

G

Gansfort, origin of name, i 42
Gansevoort, families in America, i iii, 42; members of family witness reinterment of Wessel's bones, iii, 111; Peter, presented with earliest edition of Farrago, vi; Henry Sanford, how his interest in Wessel led ultimately to preparation of these volumes iii, *vide* Lansing
Geldenhauer, leader in the Reformation, i 155; records Wessel's prophecy to Oestendorp, ii 325; translation of his sketch of Wessel's life, 345–347
Gerson, his influence in Reforming Councils, *i 32*, *65*, ii 178; criticized Church administration, i 33, 151; prominent Nominalist, 67; reformatory influence in University of Paris, 78; relation in point of time to Wessel, 42, 150; quoted by Wessel, *123*, *206*:—on indulgences, 289–294, 299, 328; on remission of sins, 306; on authority of pope and Scriptures, 308–310; on times and seasons, *215*, ii 156
Ghosts, Wessel's opinion concerning, *i 124*, *173–174*, 239–241
Girolamo and Sixtus IV, ii 152
Gospel, authority of, *i 136*, *215*, ii 166; *vide* Eternal Gospel
Goswin, Wessel's *famulus*, *i 105*, *154*, ii 327; heard discussions between Wessel and Agricola, *i 105*, *154*, ii 326; letters to Hardenberg, 327–333
Greek, accurate knowledge of, essential to biblical preparation for the Reformation, i 151–152; Wessel's knowledge of, *57*, ii 321; *i 78*, ii 345–346; i 100, 103; *107*, ii 340; i 117; 119; *162*, ii 326; 319; *i 85*, ii 325; Greek authors cited by Wessel, i 122–123, 206; *vide* Alexander, Aristotle, Plato, Proclus, Themistius; Greek words occurring in the Farrago:—ii 22, 25, 154, 210, 236, 241, 302
Gregory the Great, quoted by Wessel:—on indulgences, i 277, 296; on responsibility for crime, ii 181; on obtaining merit after death, 289
Gregory XI criticized by Wessel, i 301
Gregory Nazianzen, Wessel's copy of his works shown to Hardenberg, *i 107*, ii 340; quoted by Wessel, *i 123*, *206*, on purgatorial fire, 325
Groningen, Wessel's birthplace, *i 42*, ii 317, 345; schooling in, *i 13*, *43*, ii 318; return to, i 97–100; last years spent near, i 102–111; *vide* Adwerd, Spiritual Maidens; burial place, *i 110–111*, ii 344, 347
Groot, Gerhard, founder of order of Brethren of the Common Life, i 5–7; course of religious instruction urged by, 11; founder of model monastery at Windesheim, 14; founder of school at Zwolle, 44

H

habitualis, ii 279
habitus, i 290, ii 74, 266, 279
Hardenberg, Albert, his life of Wessel:—i 41, 155; translation, ii 317–344; on Wessel's change to Nominalism, *i 70*, ii 322–323;

Hardenberg, Albert—(*Continued*) on Wessel's expulsion from Paris, *i 76, 90*, ii 324, 326; his visit to Mt. St. Agnes, *i 106–107*, ii 340–341; Goswin's letters to, 327–333; on Wessel's Eucharist, *i 187–189*, ii 334–337
Harnack's conclusions as to Wessel's Protestantism, i 130
Hebrew, accurate knowledge of, essential to biblical preparation for the Reformation, i 151–152; Wessel's knowledge of, *57*, ii 321; *i 76*, ii 326, 325; i 100, *103*, ii 343; *i 107*, ii 340; i 118–*119*, ii 325; *i 162*, ii 326; *i 85*, ii 325; Hebrew words occurring in the Farrago, ii 25, 27, 33, 40–41
Hegius, Alexander, trained in school of Brethren of the Common Life, i 13; pupil of Agricola, 37; head of school at Deventer, 109, 154; letter to Wessel:—summary of, *186*, translation, 332–333
Heidelberg, *vide* University
Hierarchy, *vide* Wessel (subdivision —As a Protestant); Ecclesiastical Power
Hoeck, Jacob, his opinion of Wessel's obstinacy, *i 116*, 276–278; his letter to Wessel:—summary of, *181–182*, translation, 276–283; Wessel's brief letter to: —summary of, *179–180*, translation, 266–267; Wessel's long letter to:—summary of, *182–185*, translation, 284–330; admits value of tradition, *183–184*, 298–299, 306; effect of sacrament, *184*, 307; value of logic to theologians, *184*, 309; soul's progress, *185*, 321–322; confession without love does not remove sin, *185*, 327
Honius (Hoen), Cornelius, his treatise on the Eucharist, i 145, 164; his interest in Wessel's writings, *187*, 203, ii 334–335
Hours and fast days, Wessel's discussion of Gerson's statement concerning, ii 156
Humanism, influence on Church, i 24–25; representative Humanists, 34–35, 37, 40, 82, 161; *vide* Wessel (subdivision—As a Scholar)
Huss, John, betrayed by Sigismund, i 27; burned to death, 30; pushed into the fire by Laurentius, *54–55*, ii 319; disciple of Wyclif, i 33; relation in point of time to Wessel, 150

I

Impugnatorium, attack on Wessel by Antonius de Castro, i 168, 227–228
Incarnation and Passion, Wessel's treatise on:—summary of, *i 211–214*, translation, ii 107–147; why God became man, *i 212*, ii 107–108; self-expression of God, *i 212*, ii 113; necessity of, *i 212*, ii 115, 117–118, 121; Lamb's battle with the Dragon, *i 211, 213*, ii 122–136; Cross and Flaming Sword, *i 213*, ii 137–141; efficacy of Magdalene's love, *i 214*, ii 68
Indulgences, traffic in the Netherlands, i 17; attacked by Wessel at University of Paris, *77*, 297; also in Rome, *88*, 298; Wessel's attack more radical than Luther's, 146; letters concerning:—summary of, *179–185*, translation, 266–330; as to being established by Boniface VIII, 300; septennial indulgences established by Gregory, 277, 296; as to Gerson's statements concerning, 279–280, 289–294; attitude of the Fathers to, 286–287; St. Peter issued only genuine bull of, *220*, 295–296, ii 252–253; Pope Clement's abuse of, i 304; no necessity for plenary indulgences, 318–319; at moment of death, 294–295, 325–327; Hoeck's opinion concerning, 277–282; Wessel denies pope's authority to grant, *i 219*, 304–305, 317, 319, ii 194, 228, 233, 237, 240–244; with reference to purgatory, *i 200–201*, ii 33, 36; i 319–325, ii 297–300
intellectus, agens, ii 84–88; *possibilis*, 84
Irenæus, Wessel's idea of transforming power of sacrament possibly derived from, i 198

J

Jerome of Prague, tried and burned, i 30; disciple of Wyclif, 33, 95;

Jerome of Prague—(*Continued*) posted Protestant theses at Heidelberg, 95
Jerome, Saint, quoted by Wessel, *i 123*, 206:—not an authority on indulgences, 296; as to authority of priests, 314; responsibility of humble Christians, *143*, ii 181–182; sincere in spite of defending an error, i 286, ii 282; study of his works urged by Goswin, 331
Joan of Arc in Hundred Years' War, i 28
John XXII and Indulgences, i 306
John XXIII, example of papal error, *i 215*, ii 152, 178
John of Aachen, obscure author alluded to by Wessel, *i 206*, ii 92
John of Amsterdam, Wessel's letter to:—summary of, *i 177–178*, translation, 250–251; his letter to Bernard of Meppen:—summary of, *179*, translation, 261–265
John of Arkel instituted reforms during his bishopric, i 16
John of Brussels, Wessel's teacher at University of Paris, *i 73*, 297
John of Cologne, Wessel's friendship with, i 115
John of Montesono convicted of error by Peter d'Ailly, i 308–309
John of Picardy, Wessel's instructor at University of Paris, *i 63*, *73*, 297
John of Wesel tried for heresy, i 54, 94, 97–98, 122, *171–172*, 236–237, ii 346
Judas Iscariot cited by Wessel as proof that love is more acceptable to God than penitence, ii 218–221
Justification by faith, *i 130–133*, ii 35–36, 143–147; 326; i 214

K

Kempis, Thomas à, trained in school of Brethren of the Common Life, i 13; canon at Mt. St. Agnes, *45*, ii 341; influence on Wessel, *i 45–47*, *147*, *151*, *205–206*, ii 318; Wessel's influence in his revision of *The Imitation of Christ*, i 47
Keys of the Church, Wessel's conception of, *i 144*, *217*, 289, 302–305, ii 192–196; in the hands of corrupt prelates, 179–180
Kings, Wessel's opinion concerning authority of, i 29; *216*, ii 176–177; 161; people responsible for arrogance of, 182
Knowledge, use and abuse of, ii 206–211
Koran, Wessel's acquaintance with, i 123

L

Lansing, Mrs. Abraham (Catherine Gansevoort), owner of earliest edition of Farrago, i vi; encourages preparation of these volumes on Wessel, iii, xi
Laurence of Groningen, founded Bursary at University of Cologne, *i 49–50*, ii 319; thrust John Huss into the fire, *i 54–55*, ii 319
Lawrence, Saint, resisted Roman Emperor, i 250, ii 181
Laws, when obligatory, ii 160
Letters, "patent," employed in publishing plenary indulgences, ii 228; Wessel's letters:—facts concerning and summary of, *i 167–186*, translation, 231–333; *vide* Wessel (subdivision — Writings); also names of persons addressed
Liber, Antonius, his panegyric ode to Wessel, i 99–100
Life, eternal, dependent on belief in and remembrance of Christ, ii 7, 12–13, 27, 34, 62–64, 117–119
"Little Ones," defined, i 208; Eucharist a means of salvation to, *194–195*, ii 16–17; their simple faith, 35; contrasted with more advanced Christians, 43; offenses toward, 172–175; *et passim*.
Logic, a necessity for theologians, *i 184*, 308–309; unnecessary for women, *174*, 241–242
Louis XI attempts to suppress Nominalism, i 63, 68, 90
Louvain, *vide* University
Love, induced by the Eucharist, *i 193*, ii 4–5; *i 196*, ii 30; essential to spiritual life, *i 195*, ii 23; life and nourishment of the soul, *i 207*, 310, ii 61; plenary indulgence conditioned on plenary love, *i 185*, 327; growth of, ii 32; true *latria*, 45; better than mere contrition, 221–222; Purgatory a place of increasing love, *vide* Purgatory

Luder, Peter, Humanist, i 37
Lull, Raymond, quoted by Wessel, *i 123, 208*, 310, ii 61
Luther, contrasted with Wessel, i 15; disbelief of solar system, 22; appealed to General Council, 31; impressions of his visit to Rome, 88–89; opinion of Wessel's Latin style, *119*, 232; and superstitions of his day, 124; on Wessel's ideas, 129; attack on indulgences contrasted with Wessel's, 146; relation in point of time to Wessel, 150; blending of Mysticism and Humanism, 151; mistaken as to circulation of Wessel's writings, 129, 156; in controversy concerning Wessel's Eucharist, 160–161, 164–166, *187–188*, *198*, ii 335–337; his absolute determinism, i 211; prefatory letter to Wessel's writings:—summary of, *169–170*, translation, 231–233

M

Macarius Brothers and the Eucharist, ii 61, 198
Magdalene, typical example of saving religious experience, *i 207*, ii 144; her love of Christ, *i 214*, ii 67–68; 32–33, 121–122, i 244; no penance required of her by Christ, *218*, ii 221; 200, 217, 222, 227–233; and Virginity, *i 221*, ii 271–272; her righteousness greater than Adam and Eve's, 283–284
Magister (Peter Lombard), as to his title, i 43; interpretation of Augustine's statement concerning binding and loosing, 312–314; on Virginity, ii 265
Marburg Colloquy, i 165
Mare Magnum, begun at University of Cologne, *i 56–57*, ii 320; lost, *i 107, 112, 157*, ii 340
Maro studied by Wessel, *i 70*, 285
Marsilius of Padua criticized Church administration, i 33
Marsilius Ficinus, head of Platonic Academy, i 80
Mass, hearer's thought during, ii 3–4; benefits to founders of, *i 220*, ii 260–265
Mezeray mentions Wessel as Rector of University of Paris, i 71
Melanchthon, his original name, i 43; student at Heidelberg University, 91, 95; and Reuchlin, 76, 153; extract from his oration on Agricola, ii 326; opinion of Wessel, *i 162–163*, ii 326
Mendicant Monks, their opposition to Wessel at Paris, *i 77*, ii 324; destroyed Wessel's manuscripts after his death, *i 124, 156–157*, ii 335, 339; i 204; their election of Superiors commended by Wessel, *216*, ii 176
Merit, men not justified by, ii 102; sharing in, 255–257, 289
Miracle defined, *i 210*, ii 78, 73
Monasteries, needed reform in Netherlands, i 13–14
Monasticism, purpose of, *i 221*, ii 266
Mount St. Agnes, Wessel's friendship with Thomas à Kempis, a canon there, *i 45–47*, ii 318, 341; one of Wessel's homes in his declining years, *i 101, 106*, ii 335, 340, 346; Hardenberg's visit to, *i 106–107*, ii 340–341; Wessel's devotional work for the monks of, i 100, 107, 199
Muurling, his essays on Wessel, i x; views as to Wessel's visits to Groningen, 97; mentions writers quoted by Wessel, 123
Mysticism, in the Netherlands, i 12; in Rhine country, 33; and Nominalism, 67; Wessel's tendency to, 126, 132–133; Wessel avoids error of, 211

N

Nameless Nun, Wessel's letter to, i 109; summary of, *174–175*, translation, 243–245
Nazianzen, *vide* Gregory Nazianzen
Netherlands, importance in European history, i 3; prosperity in fifteenth century, 4; national liberty regained, 4; condition of Church in, 4–20; education, 11; cloister life in, *173–175*, 239–245; *vide* Adwerd, Mount St. Agnes, Spiritual Maidens
Nicholas V, his character and some incidents of his pontificate, i 34; Wessel's relation to, ii 323
Nicholas of Cusa, *vide* Cusa
Nicholas of Ragusa's library at Basel, i 91

Nicolaus of Utrecht discussed Realism and Nominalism with Wessel, *i 73*, 285, ii 322–323
Nominalism, conflict with Realism, i 38, 66–69; Wessel converted to, 57–58, *69–70*, *73*, 285, ii 322–323; mentioned approvingly by Wessel, i 270, 288, 302, 323

O

Occam, champion of Nominalism, i 67
Œcolampadius' attitude to Wessel's conception of Eucharist, *i 160*, *165*, *188*, ii 336–337
Œstendorp, Johannes, Wessel's prophecy concerning theologians, ii 325–326; teacher of Goswin and Geldenhauer, 327, 346
Origen, quoted by Wessel, i 123; Wessel's views on Eternal Gospel suggest influence of, 223, ii 307–310
Ottoman Turks, invade Europe, i 26; Eastern Church seeks aid against, 31; failure of efforts of Calixtus III against, 34; crusade organized by Paul II against, 35; aggressions after Paul II, 35; relation of fall of Constantinople to Wessel's life, 150

P

Pappus, Peter, editor of complete works of Wessel, i 168, 228
Paracelsus claimed supernatural power as physician, i 121
Paradise identical with Purgatory, *i 146*, *208*, *222*, 255–256, 260, 321–322, ii 98–99, 287, 293–300
Paris, its condition in Wessel's time, i 61; *vide* University
Parisian Article, ii 85
Pastors, when they are to be followed, ii 157–159, 165, 169–172
Paul II, his pontificate, i 35, 83; Pope during Wessel's residence in Rome, *79*, 297; suppressed the Roman Academy, 82
Paul, the Hermit, and the sacraments, *i 196*, ii 29, 31, 263–264
Paul, Saint, typical example of saving religious experience, *i 207*, ii 35, 59, 241–242, 251–252, 259; corrected Peter, *i 214–215*, ii 151–153, 162, 189
Paul of Thebes, and the sacraments, *i 218*, ii 198; needed no papal remission, 251
Paulus' treatise on Wessel's life and doctrines, i x
Pelantin(us), Paul(us), extracts from his *Epicedium*, i 48, 117, 120; his epitaph to Wessel, ii 344; mentioned by Hardenberg, 327, 337, 339
Penance, sacrament of, Wessel's view concerning, i 145–146, 208; Wessel's treatise on:—summary of, *216–219*, translation, ii 187–245; power of Apostles, *i 217*, ii 187; power of pope, *i 217*, ii 194; as to excommunication, *i 218*, ii 205; effects of, *i 218*, ii 229; power of priest in confession, *i 219*, ii 222; plenary indulgence, *i 219*, ii 237; *vide* Baptism
Perfection, impossible on earth, ii 102–104, 307; counsels of, 156
Peter of Luna, *vide* Benedict XIII
Peter, Saint, typical example of saving religious experience, *i 207*, ii 217, 227, 251–252; error of, *vide* Paul, Saint; and keys of the Church, *i 144*, *217*, 302–305, ii 192–196; issued only bull of indulgence, *i 220*, 295–296, ii, 252–253; his pastoral commission, 295–300; his repentance and complete forgiveness, 267–272; and celibacy, 268
Petri, Adam, on circulation of Wessel's writings, *i 157*, *170*, 234; his editions of the Farrago, *160*, 167, 169, 228, 234; letter to Conrad Faber:—summary of, *170–171*, translation, 234–235
Philip II, created new dioceses in the Netherlands, i 16
Philip the Bold acquired control of the Netherlands, i 18–19
Philip the Good, his reign in the Netherlands, i 19; influence in the Netherlands, 17, 107
Philip the Palatine, patron of Agricola, i 37; called Wessel to professorship in University of Heidelberg, *91*, ii 322
Pico della Mirandola, in Florence, i 80; devotion to study, ii 331
Pietro Riario and Sixtus IV, ii 152
Pius II, his pontificate, i 35; Humanist, 37; called himself Æneas Sylvius, 43; assumed unwarranted authority, *215*, ii 152

Plato, study of his works developed Nominalism, i 38; studied by Wessel, *57*, ii 319, 345; quoted by Wessel, *i 123*, *206*, ii 73, 210; study of his works recommended by Goswin, ii 330
Pomponius Loetus and the Academy at Rome, i 82
Pope, pontiffs contemporary with Wessel, i 34–37, 83–87; claim of divine authority, 134–136; Wessel's attitude toward:—obedience to, *136*, ii 163, 169; *i 143*, ii 242, 172, 236; belief in, *i 136*, ii 166, 202, 151, 204; *vs.* authority of Scriptures, *i 136*, 305; and Church, *138–139*, ii 202–203; *vs.* wise layman, i 144, ii 177–178; power of binding and loosing, *i 144*, *217*, ii 187–196; subject to error, *i 144*, ii 152–153; as to indulgences and excommunications, *i 208*, *217–218*, ii 194–195, 205, i 317, 319; *219*, 317, 319, ii 228, 233, 237, 240–243; authority to dispense from Treasury of the Church, *i 208*, *220*, 282, 315–317, ii 233, 241, 250–251, 278–280; remission of sins, *i 222*, ii 277–278; jurisdictional authority, i 289–291, ii 275–276; and purgatory, *i 219*, ii 296–300; control of benefices, ii 156; *vide* Bulls
Prayers for the dead, Wessel's views concerning, *i 124*, *147*, *177*, *223–224*, 247–249, 261–265; sharing in, ii 256, 263–264
Prelates, Wessel's conception of their office, *i 141*, *208*, ii 157, 160–161; *i 142*, ii 257; removal of evil prelates, *i 143*, ii 154–155; obedience to, *i 144*, ii 162; *i 215*, ii 157–158, 166, *i 216*, ii 178, 160–179; arrogance due to people's laxity, *i 216*, ii 182; scandalous lives of, *i 215*, ii 155; belief in, ii 151; dispensations of, ii 183–184; errors of, ii 173–179, 205, 213, 244–245; concerning married prelates, *i 221*, ii 268
Priest, Wessel's belief in universal priesthood, *i 214*, *140–141*, ii 196, 45; relation between priest and people, *i 143*, ii 160–161; *vide* Baptism, Confession, Eucharist, Penance, Sacraments
Printing, influence of invention of, i 38–39, 150; inspired interest in sacred languages, 152
Proclus quoted by Wessel, *i 123*, *206*, ii 73
Propositions, series of, *i 211*:—exposition of biblical idea, ii 144–147; allegorical: Lamb and Dragon, 122–136; Cross and Flaming Sword, 136–141
Providence of God, Wessel's treatise on:—summary of, *i 209–211*, translation, ii 73–104; nature and miracle defined, *i 210*, ii 78; will of God and salvation, *i 210*, ii 79; potential intellect, *i 210*, ii 87; man's life dependent on God, *i 210*, ii 91
Purgatory, letters pertaining to:—summary of, *i 176–179*, translation, 246–265; Wessel's treatise on:—summary of, *i 221–224*, translation, ii 275–315; identical with paradise, *i 146*, *208*, *222*, 255–256, 260, 321–322, ii 98–99, 287, 293–300; increase of soul's love in, *i 200*, ii 32–33, i 223, 329, ii 286, 292–300, 307; spiritual progress in, *i 222*, ii 288, *i 223*, ii 286, 301–310, 313–315; purgatorial fire, *i 222–223*, 319–322, ii 32–33, 238, 280–285, 289–300; power of pope concerning, *i 222*, ii 276–281; *vide* Eternal Gospel, Indulgences, Prayers for the dead
Pythagoras, on visions, i 124; Wessel criticizes his "animal wisdom," ii 210

Q

Quappo and Wessel's call to Heidelberg, i 285

R

Rabineus and belief in pope, ii 204
Radbertus on transubstantiation, i 191
Ratramnus on transubstantiation, i 191
Realism, conflict with Nominalism, i 38, 65–69; Wessel abandons it for Nominalism, *57–58*, *69–70*, ii 322–323; opinion of Realists concerning confession cited by Wessel, ii 216

Reason and authority of Scriptures compared by Wessel, *i 136*, 305
Recurrent ideas in the Farrago, i 206–209
Regner(us) Prædinius, disciple of Wessel, i 160; preserved Wessel's writings, ii 333–334
Renaissance, influence of:—in Europe, i 23–25; in Italy, 27
Reuchlin, opposed at University of Cologne, i 54; in Platonic Academy, 80; Wessel's disciple and friend:—in Paris, *75*, *153*, ii 325; in Basel, i 91; in Heidelberg, 95; superior to Wessel in philology, 119; influence on study of Scriptures, 135
Reyniers, Gertrude, Wessel's letter to:—summary of, *i 124*, *173–174*, translation, 239–242
Rhodius (Rode), Luther's letter to:—summary of, *i 156*, *169–170*, translation, 231–233; in controversy over the Eucharist, *160*, *187–188*, ii 334–337; influence on Martin Bucer, i 160–161
Rome, effect on Wessel, i 84–90
Rupert of Deutz, influence of his works on Wessel, *i 55–56*, ii 320–321
Ruysbroek, John, influence of, i 5–6; criticized traffic in indulgences, 17

S

Sabellianism, Nominalists accuse Realists of, i 67
Sabellius, St. Jerome's error worse than that of Sabellius, i 286
Sacraments, Wessel's conception of, i 144, *175*, 244, *184*, 307; efficacy of, 208, 218, *220–221*, ii 260–264; and Christ, 197; and Church, 196–198; part of priest in, 31, *222–224*, *237*; *vide* Baptism, Confession, Eucharist, Penance.
Sagarus, his visit to Groningen, *i 111*, *159*, ii 338–339
Salvation, through sacraments, faith, and righteousness, ii 36; due entirely to God, 79; through belief alone, 100; through name of Christ, 114–116; depends on ourselves, 263
Savonarola, his attempt to reform Florence, i 27; his comment on faith in astrology, 123
Scala Meditationis, dedicated to the monks of Mt. St. Agnes, i 100, 199; required knowledge of Greek, 107
Schism, Western, account of, i 29–39; increased the influence of University of Paris, 64
Scholasticism, defined, i 65; attitude of Scholastics to Aristotle and Plato, 65, 81
Scotus, Duns, taught in Universities of Cologne and Paris, i 53–54; a Formalist, *66*, 288; studied by Wessel, *69–70*, 285; quoted by Hoeck concerning sacramental confession, 278
Schulze, Ludwig, on circulation of Wessel's writings, i 156
Scriptures, widespread study of, in the Netherlands during fifteenth century, i 4–12; Wessel's insistence on authority of, i 133–134; *135*, 252–253; *136*, ii 163, 169, i 272, ii 202, i 305–306; on interpretation of, *i 208*, ii 36, 167, 204; *i 137*, ii 245
Sigismund, and Hussite Wars, i 27; and Council of Constance, 27, 30
Simony, Wessel's view of, *i 215*, ii 155
Sin, as to change of everlasting to temporal punishment, i 280–281, 314–316; remission of, 272, 307, 311–313, 325–329, ii 225–244, 262, 299–300; satisfaction for, 215–233; remission of, in future life, 289
Sixtus IV, pontificate of, i 35–37, 83–84; friendship with Wessel at University of Paris, *74–75*, ii 323–324; in Rome, *i 79*, ii 324; student at Platonic Academy, i 80; offered Wessel a bishopric, *85*, ii 324–325; presented Wessel with Greek Testament, i 85, 157; sanctioned Brethren of the Common Life, 86; Wessel acted as his physician, 72, 120; criticized by Wessel, *142*, *215*, 273, ii 152; invited Wessel to visit Rome again, i 90, 100
Sleep, Wessel's reflections upon, ii 82–84
Soul, Wessel's statement as to three faculties of, *i 199*, ii 6, 8, *et passim*
Spain under Ferdinand and Isabella, i 28

Spiritual Maidens, Convent of:—Wessel's home in, i 101, 173, 185; visit of Sagarus to, *i 111*, *159*, ii 338–339; Wessel's body buried in, *i 110*, ii 344, 347
Stephen, Saint, Wessel discusses question whether he passed immediately into glory, i 250, ii 310–311
Sword, Flaming, allegory of, *i 211*, *213*, ii 136–140
Sylvius, Æneas, *vide* Pius II

T

Talmud, Wessel's acquaintance with, i 123
Tauler, influence of, i 5, 54
Tezley's biography of Wessel, i x
Themistius quoted by Wessel, *i 206*, ii 83, 319
Thief, the blessed, typical example of saving religious experience, *i 207*, *211*, 282, ii 98–99, 287, 306
Thomas de Cursellis quoted by Hoeck and Wessel, i 279, 304
Tradition, Wessel's views as to value of, *i 136*, *183–184*, 298–299, 301
Treasury of the Church, Wessel's conception of, defined, i 207; in its relation to indulgences, *208*, *219–220*, 282, 315–317, ii 233, 241, 250–251, 278–280

U

Ullerston criticized Church administration, i 33
Ullmann, his essay on Wessel's life and writings, i x; emphasizes Wessel's theological views rather than life, vii; contrasts Thomas à Kempis with Wessel, 46–47; characterizes conflict of intellect in Cologne, 52; regards Wessel as principal founder of Reformed Churches, 166
Universities, Medieval, their cosmopolitan character, i 21; organization, 50–51; Wessel a disputant in many, 267; Wessel's criticism of, *77–78*, ii 214;
BASEL, Wessel at, *i 91*, ii 326;
BOLOGNA, famous for Faculty of Law, i 50–51;
COLOGNE:—struggle between Realism and Nominalism, i 38; Wessel a student at, *49–58*, *151*, ii 319–322, 344; Wessel's opinion of morals in, *i 77–78*, ii 214;
HEIDELBERG:—offer of chair of theology to Wessel, *i 59*, *91*, 285; twenty years later Wessel accepted a professorship, *91*, ii 322; possessed a liberal Faculty, i 91; Faculty's opposition to Wessel, *92*, ii 322; nursery of Protestant leaders, i 94–95; produced the Heidelberg Catechism, 95–96;
LOUVAIN:—compared with Cologne, i 49; Wessel a student at, *60*, ii 322;
PARIS:—charter conferred, i 50; organizations of students, 62; status of theological Faculty, 63–64; dominated Church and State in France, 64–65; Realism *vs.* Nominalism, 65–69; Wessel converted to Nominalism, *57–58*, *69–70*, *73*, 285, ii 322–323; Wessel's official relations to, i 70–71, 116, 118; Wessel's instructors at, *73*, 285, ii 322, i 297; Wessel's friendship:—with Bessarion, *73–74*, ii 324; with Francis de Rovere, *i 74–75*, ii 323–324; Wessel's stand for the truth, i 286; theological Faculty *vs.* Pope Clement, 304; punishment of preachers at, 309; Wessel's part in reforms at, 77–78; Wessel's alleged expulsion from, *76–77*, *90*, *129*, ii 324, 326; Wessel's opinion of morals at, *i 77*, ii 214; Wessel's influence at, 344;
PRAGUE, late but rapid development of, i 51
Urban VI, revolt against, i 29
Utrecht, Bishops of, i 16–17; *vide* David of Burgundy

V

Valla, Laurentius, contemporary with Wessel, i 150
van Caster, collector of Wessel's writings, ii 340–341
van Cloester, pupil and friend of

van Cloester—(*Continued*)
Wessel, ii 318; collector of Wessel's writings, 320–321, 340–341
van Doetenghen, Wessel's Procurator at Zwolle, i 48
van Halen, *vide* Goswin
van Halen, John, Director of Convent of Spiritual Maidens, *i 111*, ii 339
van Veen, Ludolph, Wessel's letter to:—i 98–99, 108, 122; summary of, *171–172*, translation, 236–238; Propositions sent by Wessel to, ii 304–307
Vincent, Saint, resisted Roman Emperor, ii 181
Virginity, Wessel's attitude to, i 146, *221*, ii 265–272
Virgin Mother, Wessel's attitude to, *i 47*, ii 318; *i 147*, ii 32, 131, 139, 267–268, 271

W

Waldenses, influence of, i 33
"Wayfarers," Christians are, *i 207*, ii 30, 34; *et passim;* in purgatory, *i 222*, ii 287
Wesel, John of, his trial for heresy, i 54, 94, 97–98, ii 346; Wessel's letter to van Veen in which he refers to the trial, i 98–99, 122, *171–172*, 236–238
WESSEL
Life, scanty materials for, i 41–42; Hardenberg's sketch, ii 317–344; Geldenhauer's outline, ii 345–347;
birth, *i 42*, ii 317, 345;
family, *i 43*, ii 317, 345; family name, *vide* Gansfort;
physical defects, *i 44*, *114*, ii 317, 343, 346;
schooling, *vide* Brethren of the Common Life;
condition of Netherlands during his youth, i 4–20;
contemporary with six popes, i 34–37;
at University of Cologne, *i 49–58*, *151*, ii 319–322; *vide* University;
first call to Heidelberg, *i 59*, *91*, 285;
at University of Louvain, *i 60*, ii 322; *vide* University;
at University of Paris, *i 60–78*, ii 322–324; *vide* University;
at Council of Basel, *vide* Councils;
alleged expulsion from Paris, *i 76*, *90*, ii 324, 326; *vide* Mendicant Monks;
in Rome, *i 79–90*, ii 324–325;
in Venice and Florence, *i 80–81*, 100;
visits Egypt and Greece, ii 341–342; 345–346; improbable, i 90, 119;
at University of Basel, *vide* University;
at University of Heidelberg, *i 91–96*, ii 322; *vide* University;
never entered priesthood, *i 92–93*, ii 317, 322;
in danger of Inquisition, *i 94*, *97–99*, *171–172*, 236–238;
return to Groningen, i 99–100;
last ten years, *i 100–110*, ii 325–344; *vide* Adwerd, Mt. St. Agnes, Spiritual Maidens;
last sickness, *i 110*, ii 346–347; death, *i 110–111*, ii 333, 344, 347;
portrait, i 113–114
As a Scholar, mental characteristics, *i 43–49*, ii 317; *vide* Brethren of the Common Life;
a cosmopolite, i 21, 26; a Humanist, i 25, 56, 83, 121–123, 132, 151;
a typical medieval scholar, i 41;
knowledge of languages, *vide* Arabic, Chaldee, Greek, Hebrew;
obtained Master's degree, *i 53*, ii 319; lacked Doctorate, *i 92–93*, ii 322;
wide reading, *i 55–56*, *122–123*, ii 319–321; Latin style, *i 119*, *229*, 232;
scholarship, *i 119*, *123*, *206*, ii 319–324, 332–333, 342, 345–346;
titles, *i 43*, *230*, 277, ii 324–326, 332, 342, 345;
attitude to the Schools, *vide* Realism, Nominalism, Formalism;
influence on disciples, i 152–155

Wessel—(*Continued*)
As a Disputant, i 117, 180, 267, 285, ii 319, 322–324, 326, 342, 345–346
As a Teacher, i 116–117; influence on his disciples, i 152–155
As a Physician, i 72; *i 120*, 100; *i 120–121*, ii 333, 345–346; *i 202*, ii 20; *i 216*, ii 178–179; ii 160–161
Personality, i 113–127;
independence, i 49; *i 77*, 286; *i 78*, ii 345–346; *i 85*, ii 324–325; *i 115–116*, 276–277; *i 125*, 284–285; ii 319;
freedom from ambition, *i 92–93*, ii 318, 322; *i 118*, 285; *i 85*, ii 324–325;
humility, *i 125–126*, 284–285, ii 331;
seeker after truth, *i 125*, 284–285, 287, 298;
breadth of religious sympathies, *i 127*, ii 249–254
Instructors, at University of Cologne, *i 55*, ii 319; at University of Paris, *i 69–70*, *72–73*, 285, 297, ii 322–323
Disciples, influence on, i 152–155; reverence of, ii 320, 338–343
Friendships, i 115; *vide* Kempis, Bessarion, Sixtus IV, David of Burgundy, Hoeck, Agricola, Reuchlin
As a Protestant, i 128–148; familiarity with Scripture, i 123;
freedom from superstition, *i 47*, ii 318; *i 123–124*, *173*, 239–241; *vide* Fasting; Virgin;
on justification by faith and "good works," *i 130–133*, ii 35–36, 143–147; i 214; ii 326;
emphasis on love, i 126–127, 132–133; *vide* Love, Mysticism;
on authority of Scripture, *i 134–137*, 252; ii 163, 166, 169, i 272, ii 202; i 305–306; ii 245;
conception of Church, *i 137–139*, ii 202–203, 249–250;
on priesthood of believers, *i 140–141*, ii 196;
on limitation of hierarchical power, *i 141–144*, ii 182, 242, 257, 162;
on the sacraments, i 144–145;
on penance and indulgences, i 145–146;
on purgatory, paradise, and ecclesiastical observances, i 146–147
Relation to the Reformation, i 42, 149–166; influence as a Humanist, i 151–155;
influence of his writings, i 155–166;
more closely related to Reformed than to Lutheran Protestantism, i 163–166
Writings, copies available in American libraries, i vi; bibliography, i x; list of, *i 111–112*, ii 332–333; *vide Mare Magnum;*
circulation of, i 155–159; influence of, i 155–166
the letters, summary of, *i 167–186*, translation, 231–333; publication, 167–169;
Luther's prefatory letter, *i 169–170*, 231–233;
Adam Petri's prefatory letter, *i 170–171*, 234–235;
Wessel's letter to van Veen, *i 171–172*, 236–238;
Wessel's letter to Gertrude Reyniers, *i 173–174*, 239–242;
Wessel's letter to nameless nun, *i 174–175*, 243–245;
Wessel's letter to Bernard of Meppen, *i 176–177*, 246–249;
Wessel's letter to John of Amsterdam, *i 177–178*, 250–251;
Wessel's letter to a certain man, *i 178*, 252–260;
John of Amsterdam's letter to Bernard of Meppen, *i 179*, 261–265;
Wessel's brief letter to Hoeck, *i 179–180*, 266–267;
Wessel's letter to Engelbert of Leyden, *i 180–181*, 268–275;
Hoeck's letter to Wessel, *i 181–182*, 276–283;
Wessel's long letter to Hoeck, *i 182–185*, 284–330; *vide* Hoeck;
David of Burgundy's letter to

Wessel—(*Continued*)
Wessel, *i 185*, 331;
Alexander Hegius' letter to Wessel, *i 186*, 332–333
EUCHARIST, summary of, *i 187–202*, translation, ii 3–70; *vide* Eucharist
FARRAGO, summary of, *i 203–224*, translation, ii 73–315;
circumstances under which it was printed, i 203; structure 204;
source of materials, 204; impression made by, 205–206;
wide range of thought, 206; recurrent ideas, 206–209; *vide* Farrago;
Providence of God, summary of, *i 209–211*, translation, ii 73–104;
Incarnation and Passion, summary of, *i 211–214*, translation, ii 107–147;
Ecclesiastical Power, summary of, *i 214–216*, translation, ii 151–184;
Sacrament of Penance, summary of, *i 216–219*, translation, ii 187–245;
Communion of Saints, summary of, *i 219–221*, translation, ii 249–272;
Purgatory, summary of, *i 221–224*, translation, ii 275–315
William of Paris, reformatory influence in University of Paris, i 78; quoted by Wessel, *206*, 324, ii 289, 292
William of Phalis, Wessel's instructor at University of Paris, *i 73*, 297
Wyclif, effects of his teachings, i 32–33

Z

Zomeren, Henry, Wessel's teacher at University of Paris, *i 73*, 285, ii 322–323
Zwingli, copied Pauline epistles, i 56; relation in point of time to Wessel, 150; influenced by Wessel's treatise on the Eucharist, *145*, *164–165*, *188*, ii 336–337
Zwolle, Wessel's schooling at, *i 13*, *38*, *43–49*, ii 317–318; one of Wessel's homes in his declining years, *vide* Mount St. Agnes

WELLESLEY COLLEGE LIBRARY
3 5002 03128 8736

BX 890 .G3 1917 2
Gansfort, Wessel, 1419-1489.
Wessel Gansfort